THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

FEDERAL REGISTER

OF THE UNITED STATES

VOLUME 15 NUMBER 124

Washington, Wednesday, June 28, 1950

TITLE 16—COMMERCIAL PRACTICES

Chapter I—Federal Trade Commission

[Docket 5465]

PART 3—DIGEST OF CEASE AND DESIST ORDERS

REXALL DRUG CO. ET AL.

Subpart—*Advertising falsely or misleadingly:* § 3.155 *Prices—Exaggerated as regular and customary; terms and conditions.* Subpart—*Offering unfair, improper and deceptive inducements to purchase or deal:* § 3.2080 *Terms and conditions.* In connection with the offering for sale, sale or distribution of drug products or any other articles of merchandise in commerce, representing through the use of the term "One-Cent Sale", or words of similar import, or otherwise, that two units of respondents' merchandise may be purchased for the price of one unit plus one cent, when the price of one unit of said merchandise used in said representations is in excess of the price at which one unit of said merchandise is customarily and usually sold in the respective stores to which the representations relate; or representing in any manner that the customary or usual price of respondents' merchandise at retail stores to which the representations relate is in excess of the price at which the merchandise is by the respective stores customarily offered for sale and sold in the normal course of business; prohibited.

(Sec. 6, 38 Stat. 722; 15 U. S. C. 46. Interpret or apply sec. 5, 38 Stat. 719, as amended; 15 U. S. C. 45) [Cease and desist order, Rexall Drug Company et al., Docket 5465, April 6, 1950]

In the Matter of Rexall Drug Company, a Corporation (Formerly Known as United-Rexall Drug Company and as United Drug Company); Liggett Drug Company, Inc., a Corporation; and The Owl Drug Company, a Corporation (Named in the Complaint as Owl Drug Company)

This proceeding having been heard by the Federal Trade Commission upon the complaint of the Commission, the joint answer of respondents, and upon a stipulation as to the facts entered into between respondents and counsel supporting the complaint which provides, among other things, that the Commission may proceed upon said statement of facts to make its report stating its findings as to the facts (including inferences which it may draw from said stipulated facts) and its conclusion based thereon and enter its order disposing of the proceeding without the presentation of argument or the filing of briefs, and which waives the filing of a recommended decision by the trial examiner; and the Commission having made its findings as to the facts and its conclusion that the respondents Rexall Drug Company and The Owl Drug Company have violated the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act:

It is ordered, That respondents Rexall Drug Company, a corporation, and The Owl Drug Company, a corporation, and their respective officers, agents, representatives and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the offering for sale, sale or distribution of drug products or any other articles of merchandise in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

Representing through the use of the term "One-Cent Sale", or words of similar import, or otherwise, that two units of respondents' merchandise may be purchased for the price of one unit plus one cent, when the price of one unit of said merchandise used in said representations is in excess of the price at which one unit of said merchandise is customarily and usually sold in the respective stores to which the representations relate; or representing in any manner that that the customary or usual price of respondents' merchandise at retail stores to which the representations relate is in excess of the price at which the merchandise is by the respective stores customarily offered for sale and sold in the normal course of business.

It is further ordered, That the charges of the complaint relating to the advertising representations made by the respondent Liggett Drug Company in connection with the "One-Cent Sales" conducted by said respondent be, and the same hereby are, dismissed.

It is further ordered, That the charges of the complaint relating to certain of the representations used by respondents in the advertising of so-called "Factory-

(Continued on next page)

CONTENTS

FEDERAL REGISTER

Published daily, except Sundays, Mondays, and days following official Federal holidays, by the Division of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act, approved July 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U. S. C., ch. 8B), under regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President. Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

The regulatory material appearing herein is keyed to the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published, under 50 titles, pursuant to section 11 of the Federal Register Act, as amended June 19, 1937.

The FEDERAL REGISTER will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $1.50 per month or $15.00 per year, payable in advance. The charge for individual copies (minimum 15¢) varies in proportion to the size of the issue. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

CONTENTS—Continued

CODIFICATION GUIDE

A numerical list of the parts of the Code of Federal Regulations affected by documents published in this issue. Proposed rules, as opposed to final actions, are identified as such.

To-You" sales be, and the same hereby are dismissed without prejudice to the right of the Commission to institute a new proceeding against the respondents or to take such further or other action in the future as may be warranted by the then existing circumstances.

It is further ordered, That the respondents Rexall Drug Company and The Owl Drug Company shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon them of this order, file with the Commission a report in writing setting forth in detail the manner and form in which they have complied with this order.

Issued: April 6, 1950.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] D. C. DANIEL, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5542; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:49 a. m.]

[File No. 21-423]

PART 191—VENETIAN BLIND INDUSTRY

PROMULGATION OF TRADE PRACTICE RULES

Due proceedings having been held under the trade practice conference procedure in pursuance of the act of Congress approved September 26, 1914, as amended (Federal Trade Commission Act), and other provisions of law administered by the Commission:

It is now ordered, That the trade practice rules of Group I and Group II, as hereinafter set forth, which have been approved and received, respectively, by the Commission in this proceeding, be promulgated as of June 28, 1950.

Statement by the Commission. Trade practice rules for the Venetian Blind Industry, as hereinafter set forth, are promulgated by the Federal Trade Commission under the trade practice conference procedure.

The rules are directed to the prevention of various unfair trade practices and the maintenance of fair competitive conditions in the public interest in harmony with the requirements of law.

Industry members are the persons, firms, corporations, and organizations engaged in the manufacture, assembly, sale, or distribution of venetian blinds or parts or accessories therefor. The rules define and proscribe unfair trade practices in the sale, offering for sale, or distribution of such venetian blinds, parts and accessories, and of products represented as being venetian blinds. Aggregate annual sales of venetian blinds at retail approximate $200,000,000.

Proceedings for the establishment of rules were instituted upon application made by industry members. A general industry conference was held under Commission auspices in Chicago, Illinois, at which proposals for rules were submitted for consideration of the Commission. Thereafter a draft of proposed rules was published by the Commission and made available to all industry members and other interested or affected parties upon public notice whereby they were afforded opportunity to present their views, including such pertinent information, suggestions, amendments, or objections, as they desired to offer, and to be heard in the premises. Pursuant to such notice, public hearing was held in Washington, D. C., and all matters there presented, or otherwise received in the proceeding, were duly considered by the Commission.

Following such hearing, and upon full consideration of the entire matter, final action was taken by the Commission whereby it approved and received, respectively, the Group I and Group II rules as hereinafter set forth.

Such rules become operative thirty (30) days from the date of promulgation.

The rules. These rules promulgated by the Commission are designed to foster and promote the maintenance of fair competitive conditions in the interest of protecting industry, trade, and the public. It is to this end, and to the exclusion of any act or practice which suppresses competition, restrains trade, fixes or controls price through combination or agreement, or which otherwise injures, destroys, or prevents competition, that the rules are to be applied.

Sec.

AUTHORITY: §§ 191.0 to 191.102 issued under sec. 6, 38 Stat. 721; 15 U. S. C. 46.

§ 191.0 *Definitions.* As used in this part the terms "industry products" and "industry member" shall have the following meanings, respectively:

(a) *Industry products.* The products of the industry consist of (1) venetian blinds of all types, (2) parts of venetian blinds, including slats, tape, cord, hardware, facia, head bars, bottom rails, and other findings, and (3) venetian blind accessories.

(b) *Industry member.* Any person, firm, corporation, or organization engaged in the manufacture, assembly, sale, or distribution of venetian blinds or parts, or accessories therefor.

GROUP I

General statement. The unfair trade practices embraced in the Group I rules herein are considered to be unfair methods of competition, unfair or deceptive acts or practices, or other illegal practices, prohibited under laws administered by the Federal Trade Commission; and appropriate proceedings in the public interest will be taken by the Commission to prevent the use, by any person, partnership, corporation, or other organization subject to its jurisdiction, of such unlawful practices in commerce.

§ 191.1 *Deception as to product being a "venetian blind."* It is an unfair trade practice to represent any product as being a venetian blind unless such product consists of numerous thin slats and other parts which are so assembled as to afford control of the admission of light and air through any size window, door, or aperture for which the product is designed by permitting of the raising, lowering, and holding of the slats at different positions, and the simultaneous opening, closing, tilting, and setting thereof at any angle, by easy manual operation, the slats remaining parallel to each other, and their ends in alignment throughout any such operations. [Rule 1]

§ 191.2 *Misuse of terms "custom built," "made to order," etc.* In the sale, offering for sale, or distribution of venetian blinds, it is an unfair trade practice for an industry member to use the terms "custom built," "made to order," or any other words or terms of similar import, as descriptive of any venetian blind which has not been made in accordance with specifications as to size, color, quality, etc., supplied by the consumer-purchaser prior to the manufacture or assembly of the venetian blind, as distinguished from a product which is a ready-made or stock venetian blind. [Rule 2]

§ 191.3 *Misrepresenting products as conforming to standard.* Representing, through advertising or otherwise, that any venetian blind or other industry products conform to a standard recognized in or applicable to the industry when such is not the fact is an unfair trade practice. [Rule 3]

§ 191.4 *Misrepresentation as to being a manufacturer, wholesaler, jobber, distributor, or retailer, and concerning prices in relation thereto.* (a) It is an unfair trade practice for any industry member, by trade or corporate name or otherwise, to represent or to hold himself out as being the manufacturer,

wholesaler, jobber, distributor, or retailer of any venetian blind or other industry product advertised, offered for sale, sold, or distributed, when such is not the fact.

(b) It is an unfair trade practice to use any other deceptive or misleading device, method, or representation respecting the character, nature, or status of the business of any person, concern, or organization engaged in selling or promoting the sale of any venetian blind or other industry product.

(c) It is an unfair trade practice for any member of the industry to represent his prices as being wholesale or manufacturers' prices when such is not true in fact, or to otherwise misrepresent his prices. (See also § 191.10.) [Rule 4]

§ 191.5 *Deception as to used or rebuilt products.* (a) It is an unfair trade practice for any member of the industry to sell, offer for sale, advertise, or otherwise represent any venetian blind or other product of the industry as being new or unused when such is not the fact.

(b) In the marketing of venetian blinds which have been used or rebuilt (or contain used or rebuilt parts) and which have the appearance of being new, it is an unfair trade practice to fail to make full and nondeceptive disclosure of the fact that such products, or specified parts contained therein, as the case may be, have been subjected to previous use or have been rebuilt. [Rule 5]

§ 191.6 *Passing off substandard or defective products as and for regular or first quality merchandise.* It is an unfair trade practice to advertise, offer for sale, sell, or cause to be sold venetian blinds or other industry products which are "seconds" [1] or defective as and for first quality. When venetian blinds or other industry products which are "seconds," [1] or have latent defects, are placed on the market, they shall be labeled or marked as such, clearly and conspicuously, and in a manner sufficiently permanent as to carry to the purchasing or consuming public and prevent misunderstanding and deception of purchasers. [Rule 6]

§ 191.7 *Guarantees, warranties, etc.* It is an unfair trade practice to use or cause to be used any guarantee which is false, misleading, deceptive, or unfair to the purchasing or consuming public, whether in respect to the kind, quality, composition, serviceability, value, method of manufacture of the product, or in any other respect; or whether deceptive or misleading as to time or character of the guarantee or by reason of its being incompletely or confusingly stated; and it is also an unfair trade practice for an industry member guarantor to fail to scrupulously fulfill the terms of his guarantee.

The inhibitions of this section against deceptive or misleading use of guarantees shall also be applicable to warranties and to purported warranties or purported guarantees.

Among the practices inhibited by the foregoing provisions of this section is that of using guarantees which are stated, phrased, or set forth in such manner that although the statements contained therein are literally and technically true, the whole is misleading in that purchasers or users are not made sufficiently aware of certain contingencies or conditions applicable to such guarantees which materially lessen the value or protection thereof as a guarantee to purchasers or users. [Rule 7]

§ 191.8 *Misuse of the word "free."* The use of the word "free," or words of similar import, in advertising or otherwise, to designate or describe any product or service which is not in truth and in fact a gift or gratuity, or is not given to the recipient thereof without requiring the purchase of other merchandise, or requiring the performance of some service, inuring, directly or indirectly, to the benefit of the industry member using such word, is an unfair trade practice. [Rule 8]

§ 191.9 *False invoicing.* Withholding from or inserting in invoices any statements or information by reason of which omission or insertion a false record is made, wholly or in part, of the transactions represented on the face of such invoices, with the capacity and tendency or effect of thereby misleading or deceiving purchasers or prospective purchasers, is an unfair trade practice. [Rule 9]

§ 191.10 *Deceptive pricing.* It is an unfair trade practice for any member of the industry to advertise or otherwise represent prices for industry products which are false or which have the capacity and tendency or effect of misleading or deceiving purchasers or prospective purchasers. Among the practices inhibited by this section are:

(a) Representing or implying, in advertising or otherwise, that a stated price is for a complete venetian blind, when in fact the product so priced is deficient as to parts necessary and usual to the proper functioning and appearance of a venetian blind (such as hardware, tilt, cord stops, equalizer, facia, brackets, etc.).

(b) Representing or implying, in advertising or otherwise, that the price of any venetian blind also includes certain services, such as measuring, installing, etc., when such is not the fact.

(c) Representing, in advertising or otherwise, that the selling price of any venetian blind or other industry product has been reduced from what is in fact a fictitious price, or that such price is a reduced or special price when it is in fact the regular selling price of such venetian blind or other industry product, or that the regular selling price thereof is higher when such is not the fact.

(d) Representing or implying, in advertising or otherwise, that prices applicable only to certain sizes of venetian blinds apply to other or all sizes of blinds. The inhibitions of this paragraph shall apply when prices of venetian blinds published or advertised on a square foot or other size basis do not apply to all sizes of the blinds advertised and conjunctive and conspicuous disclosure of such fact is not made. [Rule 10]

§ 191.11 *Other forms of deception.* (a) It is an unfair trade practice to make or publish, or cause to be made or published, directly or indirectly, any false, misleading, or deceptive statement or representation, by way of advertisement, depiction, label, mark, brand, or otherwise, concerning the grade, quality, freedom from defects or imperfections, utility, durability, value, thickness, material, color, color-fastness, size, fit,[2] ease of cleaning, washability, automatism, removability, uniqueness, originality, manufacture, or distribution of any venetian blind or other industry product, or concerning the immunity or resistance of any such product to warpage, fire, rust, or sag; or concerning the identity of the manufacturer of any venetian blind or other industry product; or to make any representation concerning an industry product which is false or misleading in any other material respect.

(b) The inhibitions of this section shall be construed as extending to deceptive concealment as to the kind or kinds of materials used in venetian blinds or parts thereof.

(c) In the interest of avoiding unfair competitive practices and confusion, misunderstanding, or deception of purchasers or prospective purchasers, advertisements describing venetian blinds as having removable slats should nondeceptively reveal the manner or method by which the slats may be removed and replaced when removal or replacement is not simple and easy of accomplishment or involves the use of a tool or mechanical device or the exercise of special skill. Use of advertisements or sales promotions which are deceptive or misleading to the public by reason of the concealment or nondisclosure of the manner or method of removing and replacing the slats, or which are otherwise deceptive or false, is an unfair trade practice. [Rule 11]

§ 191.12 *Selling below cost.* The practice of selling venetian blinds or other industry products at a price less than the cost thereof to the seller, with the purpose or intent, and where the effect may be, to injure, suppress, or stifle competition or tend to create a monopoly in the production or sale of such products, is an unfair trade practice. As used in this section, the term "cost" means the total cost to the seller of any

[1] A "second" venetian blind is any blind which has repainted slats, or defects in the ladders, cord, or hardware, or defects in any of the other component parts used in the manufacture of such blinds: *Provided*, That venetian blinds having defects in the ladders, cord, hardware, or other component parts, of a nature seriously affecting use or durability, should be sold as defective merchandise and not as "seconds;" and that use of the term "seconds" should be confined to such blinds as have only defects in appearance or which are of such a nature as not to seriously affect the utility and serviceability of the blind.

[2] No representation should be made by an industry member to the effect that a venetian blind will fit any window, door, aperture, or space unless the dimensions of the blind so represented are such that the blind will upon installation provide shading and control of all light to which the window, door, aperture, or space may be exposed, and this without undue excess of coverage of the window, door, aperture, or space and without hindrance to the raising and lowering, or other functional operations, of the blind.

such transactions of sale, including the costs of acquisition, processing, preparation for marketing, sale, and delivery of such products. [Rule 12]

§ 191.13 *Substitution of products.* The practice of shipping or delivering venetian blinds or other industry products which do not conform to samples submitted, to specifications upon which the sale is consummated, or to representations made prior to securing the order, without the consent of the purchaser to such substitutions, and with the capacity and tendency or effect of misleading or deceiving purchasers, prospective purchasers, or the consuming public, is an unfair trade practice. [Rule 13]

§ 191.14 *Consignment distribution.* It is an unfair trade practice for any member of the industry to use the practice of shipping industry products on consignment or pretended consignment for the purpose and with the effect of artificially clogging or closing trade outlets and unduly restricting competitors' use of said trade outlets in getting their products to consumers through regular channels of distribution, thereby injuring, destroying, or preventing competition or tending to create a monopoly or to unreasonably restrain trade; *Provided, however,* That nothing in this section shall be construed as restricting or preventing consignment shipping or marketing of venetian blinds or other industry products in good faith where suppression of competition, restraint of trade, or undue interference with competitors' use of the usual channels of distribution, is not effected. [Rule 14]

§ 191.15 *Commercial bribery.* It is an unfair trade practice for a member of the industry, directly or indirectly, to give, or offer to give, or permit or cause to be given, money or anything of value to agents, employees, or representatives of customers or prospective customers, or to agents, employees, or representatives of competitors' customers or prospective customers, without the knowledge of their employers or principals, as an inducement to influence their employers or principals to purchase, or contract to purchase, products manufactured or sold by such industry member or the maker of such gift or offer, or to influence such employers or principals to refrain from dealing in the products of competitors or from dealing or contracting to deal with competitors. [Rule 15]

§ 191.16 *Imitation of trade-marks, trade names, etc.* The practice of imitating, or causing to be imitated, the trade-marks, trade names, or other exclusively owned symbols, marks of identification, designs, or patterns of competitors, which have not been dedicated to the public either directly or by operation of law, and where such imitation has the capacity and tendency or effect of misleading or deceiving the purchasing or consuming public, is an unfair trade practice. [Rule 16]

§ 191.17 *Defamation of competitors or disparagement of their products.* The defamation of competitors by falsely imputing to them dishonorable conduct, inability to perform contracts, questionable credit standing, or by other false representations, or the false disparagement of the grade or quality of the products of competitors or of the source or origin of raw materials or parts used in their products, or the false disparagement of the nature or form of business conducted by competitors, their credit terms, values, policies, or services, or other false disparagement, is an unfair trade practice. [Rule 17]

§ 191.18 *Procurement of competitors' confidential information by unfair means and wrongful use thereof.* It is an unfair trade practice for any member of the industry to obtain information concerning the business of a competitor by bribery of an employee or agent of such competitor, by false or misleading statements or representations, by the impersonation of one in authority, or by any other unfair means, and to use the information so obtained in such manner as to injure said competitor in his business or to suppress competition or unreasonably restrain trade. [Rule 18]

§ 191.19 *Enticing away employees of competitors.* Wilfully enticing away the employees of competitors with the purpose and effect of thereby unduly injuring or hampering competitors in their business and destroying or substantially lessening competition is an unfair trade practice.

NOTE: Nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting employees or agents from seeking or obtaining more favorable employment.

[Rule 19]

§ 191.20 *Unfair threats of infringement suits.* The circulation of threats of suit for infringement of patents or trade-marks among customers or prospective customers of competitors, not made in good faith but for the purpose or with the effect of harassing or intimidating such customers or prospective customers, or of unduly hampering, injuring, or prejudicing competitors in their business, is an unfair trade practice. [Rule 20]

§ 191.21 *Inducing breach of contract.* Inducing or attempting to induce the breach of existing lawful contracts between competitors and their customers or their suppliers by any false or deceptive means whatsoever, or interfering with or obstructing the performance of any such contractual duties or services by any such means, with the purpose and effect of unduly hampering, injuring, or prejudicing competitors in their business, is an unfair trade practice. [Rule 21]

§ 191.22 *Unlawful coercion and combination in restraint of trade.* It is an unfair trade practice for a member of the industry:

(a) To use, directly or indirectly, any form of threat, intimidation, or coercion against any member of the industry or other person to unlawfully fix, maintain, or enhance prices, suppress competition, or restrain trade; or

(b) To enter into or take part in, directly or indirectly, any agreement, understanding, combination, conspiracy, or concerted action with one or more members of the industry, or with one or more other persons, to unlawfully fix, maintain, or enhance prices, suppress competition, or restrain trade. [Rule 22]

§ 191.23 *Tie-in sales; coercing purchase of one product as a prerequisite to purchase of other products.* The practice of coercing the purchase of one or more products as a prerequisite to the purchase of one or more other products, where the effect may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly or to unreasonably restrain trade, is an unfair trade practice. [Rule 23]

§ 191.24 *Discrimination* — (a) *Prohibited discriminatory prices, or rebates, refunds, discounts, credits, etc., which effect unlawful price discrimination.* In the marketing in commerce [3] of industry products of like grade and quality for use, consumption, or resale within the jurisdiction of the United States, and subject to paragraph (b) of this section, it is an unfair trade practice for any member of the industry engaged therein to discriminate in price between different purchasers where the effect thereof may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce,[3] or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with such industry member or with any person who knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination or with their customers.

(b) The inhibitions against such discrimination in price shall be applicable irrespective of whether the discrimination in the price itself is effected in the form, or through the means, of rebates, refunds, discounts, credits, allowances, or other form of price differential.

(1) However, nothing herein contained shall prevent differentials which make only due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the differing methods or quantities in which industry products are sold or delivered to said purchasers.

(2) Nor shall anything herein contained prevent persons engaged in selling such products in commerce [3] from selecting their own customers in bona fide transactions and not in restraint of trade.

(3) Nor shall anything herein contained prevent price changes from time to time where made in response to changing conditions affecting either the market for the products concerned, or the marketability of the products, such as but not limited to actual or imminent deterioration of perishable goods, obsolescence of seasonal goods, distress sales under court process, or sales in good faith

[3] As used in this section, the word "commerce" means "trade or commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State, Territory, or foreign nation, or between any insular possessions or other places under the jurisdiction of the United States, or between any such possession or place and any State or Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia or any foreign nation, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory or any insular possession or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States."

in discontinuance of business in the products concerned.

(c) *Prohibited brokerage or commissions.* In the selling of industry products in commerce,[2] it is an unfair trade practice for any member of the industry engaged therein to pay or grant, or to receive or accept, any commission, brokerage, or other compensation, or any allowance or discount in lieu thereof, except for services rendered in connection with the sale or purchase of such products, either to the other party to such transaction or to an agent, representative, or other intermediary therein, where such agent, representative, or other intermediary is acting in fact for or in behalf, or is subject to the direct or indirect control, of any party to such transaction other than the person by whom such compensation is so granted or paid.

(d) *Prohibited advertising or promotional allowances, etc.* In the selling of industry products in commerce[3] by any member of the industry, and in the course thereof, it is an unfair trade practice for such member to pay or contract for the payment of any advertising or promotional allowances or any other thing of value to or for the benefit of his customer as compensation or in consideration for certain services or facilities furnished by or through such customer, unless such payment or consideration is available on proportionally equal terms to all other customers of such member competing in the distribution of such products.

(1) As used in this paragraph, the certain services or facilities referred to are such as are furnished by or through the customer in connection with the processing, handling, sale, or offering for sale, of such industry member's products.

(e) *Prohibited discrimination in services or facilities.* In the sale of industry products bought for resale, with or without processing, it is an unfair trade practice for any member of the industry engaged in commerce[4] to discriminate in favor of one purchaser against another purchaser by furnishing certain services or facilities upon terms not accorded to all competing purchasers on proportionally equal terms.

(1) Said services or facilities referred to in this paragraph are such as are connected with the processing, handling, sale, or offering for sale, of the products purchased, and the term "furnishing" as used in this paragraph shall be construed as including contracting to furnish, and contributing to the furnishing of, the services or facilities.

(f) *Inducing or receiving an illegal discrimination in price.* It is an unfair trade practice for any member of the industry, in the course of commerce[5] in which he is engaged, knowingly to induce or receive a discrimination in price which is prohibited by the foregoing provisions of this section.

(g) *Exemptions.* The inhibitions of this section shall not apply to purchases of their supplies for their own use by schools, colleges, universities, public libraries, churches, hospitals, and charitable institutions not operated for profit. [Rule 24]

§ 191.25 *Unlawful interference with competitors' purchases or sales.* It is an unfair trade practice for any member of the industry, by means of any monopolistic practices or through combination, conspiracy, coercion, boycott, threats, or any other unlawful means, directly or indirectly, to interfere with a competitor's right to purchase his raw materials and supplies from whomsoever he chooses, or to sell his product to whomsoever he chooses. [Rule 25]

§ 191.26 *Aiding or abetting use of unfair trade practices.* It is an unfair trade practice for any person, firm, or corporation to aid, abet, coerce, or induce another, directly or indirectly, to use or promote the use of any unfair trade practice specified in §§ 191.1 to 191.26, inclusive. [Rule 26]

GROUP II

General statement. Compliance with trade practice provisions embraced in Group II rules is considered to be conducive to sound business methods and is to be encouraged and promoted individually or through voluntary cooperation exercised in accordance with existing law. Nonobservance of such rules does not per se constitute violation of law. Where, however, the practice of not complying with any Group II rules is followed in such manner as to result in unfair methods of competition or unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce, corrective proceedings in respect thereto may be instituted by the Commission as in the case of violation of Group I rules.

§ 191.101 *Arbitration.* The industry approves the practice of handling business disputes between members of the industry and their customers in a fair and reasonable manner, coupled with a spirit of moderation and good will, and every effort should be made by the disputants themselves to compose their differences. If unable to do so they should, if possible, submit these disputes to arbitration. [Rule A]

§ 191.102 *Coercion in sales.* The use of buying power to force uneconomic or unjust terms of sale upon sellers, and the use of selling power to force uneconomic or unjust terms of sale upon buyers, are condemned by the industry. [Rule B]

Promulgated by the Federal Trade Commission June 28, 1950.

Issued: June 23, 1950.

[SEAL] D. C. DANIEL, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5632; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:58 a. m.]

TITLE 8—ALIENS AND NATIONALITY

Chapter IV—Displaced Persons Commission

REVISION OF REGULATIONS

Correction

In Federal Register Document 50-5325, appearing at page 3864 of the issue for Saturday, June 17, 1950, the following corrections have been made in the original document:

1. In § 700.7 "January 1, 1948" should read "January 1, 1938."

2. Paragraph (d) of § 702.5 is corrected by replacing the period at the end with a comma and adding: "unless it clearly appears to the Commission from the evidence that the applicant had carried out an intention to reside permanently in such country or place."

3. In the last sentence of § 702.8 (f) the word "the" should be deleted before "armed forces."

4. In § 705.3 (c) the words "is based" should be added after "under the act" in the last sentence.

5. In § 706.2 the designation "(a)" should be deleted.

6. In § 710.2 (a) the fourth line should read "Commission should notify the International Refugee".

7. In the third sentence of § 710.2 (b) "of his own cost and expense" should read "at his own cost and expense".

The following additional corrections should be made:

1. In the third line of § 701.4 (c) "subdivision (e)" should read "subdivision (a)".

2. The seventh line of § 702.6 should read: "litical group (other than Communist or".

TITLE 49—TRANSPORTATION

Chapter I—Interstate Commerce Commission

[S. O. 854, Corrected]

PART 95—CAR SERVICE

DEMURRAGE ON CARS HELD UNDER LOAD AT GREAT LAKES PORTS

At a session of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Division 3, held at its office in Washington, D. C., on the 21st day of June, A. D. 1950.

It appearing that as the result of the inability of carriers at Great Lakes ports to unload coal in the normal manner brought about by a strike of dock personnel; in the opinion of the Commission an emergency exists requiring immediate action at Great Lakes ports: It is ordered, that:

§ 95.854 *Demurrage on cars held under load at Great Lakes ports.* (a) B. T. Jones' Tariff I. C. C. 4137, supplements thereto or reissues thereof, providing car demurrage rules and charges on coal and other carload freight as described therein, applying at ports, sidings or storage yards named therein, held for lake shipment or delivery to vessels, be, and it is hereby, suspended to the extent provided in paragraph (b) of this section.

(b) On all loaded cars held at points described in the above tariff because of strike of dock personnel and during the period this section is in effect.

(c) Exception: Lake coal, vessel fuel coal, coke, crushed stone, gravel, sand or other carload freight, when loaded in open top equipment reconsigned at the

See footnote on p. 4131.

ports and storage yards named herein, for rail delivery, will be subject to the provisions of Rule 2 and Rule 3 from the first 7:00 a. m., after date on which notice of arrival was sent or given, as provided in Rule 3 (b) of this tariff to date and time reconsignment orders are received by this railroad.

(d) Application: The provisions of this section shall apply to intrastate, interstate and foreign commerce.

(e) Regulations suspended; announcement required: The operation of all rules and regulations insofar as they conflict with the provisions of this section is hereby suspended and each railroad subject to this order, or its agent, shall publish, file, and post a supplement to each of its tariffs affected hereby, in substantial accordance with the provisions of Rule 9 (k) of the Commission's Tariff Circular No. 20 (§ 141.9 (k)) of this chapter, announcing such suspension.

(f) Effective date: This section shall become effective at 7:00 a. m., June 22, 1950.

(g) Expiration date: This section shall expire at 7:00 a. m., July 31, 1950, unless otherwise modified, changed, suspended or annulled by order of this Commission.

It is further ordered, that a copy of this order and direction shall be served upon the Association of American Railroads, Car Service Division, as agent of the railroads subscribing to the car service and per diem agreement under the terms of that agreement; and that notice of this order be given to the general public by depositing a copy in the office of the Secretary of the Commission at Washington, D. C., and by filing it with the Director, Division of the Federal Register.

(Sec. 12, 24 Stat. 383, as amended, 49 U. S. C. 12. Interprets or applies sec. 1, 24 Stat. 379, as amended; 49 U. S. C. 1)

By the Commission, Division 3.

[SEAL] W. P. BARTEL, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5633; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:58 a. m.]

PROPOSED RULE MAKING

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Production and Marketing Administration

[7 CFR, Part 729]

PEANUTS

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO FORMULATE AND ISSUE REGULATIONS GOVERNING MARKETING, COLLECTION OF MARKETING PENALTIES, AND RECORDS AND REPORTS FOR THE 1950–1951 MARKETING YEAR

Pursuant to the authority contained in the applicable provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, (7 U. S. C. and Sup. 1301, 1358–1359, 1372–1375; Pub. Law 471, 81st Cong.) the Secretary of Agriculture is preparing to formulate marketing quota regulations governing the issuance of marketing cards, the identification of peanuts, the collection and refund of penalties, and the records and reports incident thereto on the marketing of peanuts for the 1950–51 marketing year. It is proposed that the regulations will be substantially the same as the 1949-crop regulations, except that, in accordance with Pub. Law 471, 81st Cong., provisions will be included which will permit a producer to market, without payment of penalty, peanuts produced on acreage in excess of the farm acreage allotment, provided the 1950 picked and threshed acreage on the farm does not exceed the 1947 picked and threshed acreage, by delivering such excess peanuts to an agency designated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

It is proposed that the collection of penalty, or the delivery of excess peanuts, to designated agencies, will be on the basis of a portion of each lot of peanuts marketed from the farm; such portion to be the percentage of the lot equal to the percentage which the acreage of peanuts in excess of the farm acreage allotment is of the total picked and threshed acreage of peanuts on the farm. In order to eliminate numerous administrative difficulties and to afford as little inconvenience as possible to producers, it is proposed that physical separation of the quota peanuts from the excess peanuts in each lot will not be required. It is anticipated that the Secretary of Agriculture will designate Commodity Credit Corporation as the agency to receive excess peanuts and that the Commodity Credit Corporation, in connection with the price support program for the 1950 crop of peanuts, may contract with shellers, warehousemen and other handlers of peanuts to receive excess peanuts for its account. The producer, if otherwise eligible for price support, would be paid not less than 90 percent of parity support price for his quota peanuts. If the peanuts were produced on a farm with excess acreage but the total acreage on the farm was not in excess of the 1947 picked and threshed acreage for the farm, the producer would have an option on each lot delivered whereby he could either (1) accept a price for his peanuts that was mutually agreeable to him and the buyer and pay the marketing quota penalty due on the portion of the lot that was excess peanuts; or (2) market the entire lot to a designated agency without payment of the penalty, receiving the prevailing oil price for the excess peanuts in the lot and not less than 90 percent of the parity price for the quota peanuts in the lot. If the peanuts were produced on a farm on which the 1950 picked and threshed acreage was in excess of both the allotment and the 1947 picked and threshed acreage for the farm, the producer could market his peanuts only under option (1) above.

Prior to issuance of such regulations, consideration will be given to any data, views, and recommendations relating thereto which are submitted in writing to the Director, Fats and Oils Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D. C. All submissions must be postmarked not later than 15 days from the date of publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Done at Washington, D. C., this 23d day of June 1950.

[SEAL] RALPH S. TRIGG, *Administrator.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5550; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:50 a. m.]

[7 CFR, Part 904]

[Docket No. AO-14-A17, A18]

HANDLING OF MILK IN GREATER BOSTON, MASS., MARKETING AREA

DECISION WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSED MARKETING AGREEMENT AND PROPOSED ORDER AMENDING ORDER, AS AMENDED

Pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 601 et seq.), and the applicable rules of practice and procedure, as amended, governing proceedings to formulate marketing agreements and marketing orders (7 CFR, Part 900), public hearings were conducted at Boston, Massachusetts, on March 16 and 17, 1949, pursuant to notice thereof which was issued on March 9, 1949 (14 F. R. 1129), and on January 30–February 1, 1950, pursuant to notice thereof which was issued on January 23, 1950 (15 F. R. 452).

This decision is made with respect to the issues raised at the January 30–February 1, 1950, public hearing and includes also findings and conclusions with respect to an issue raised at the hearing held at Boston March 16 and 17, 1949. A recommended decision and opportunity to file written exceptions with respect to the aforesaid issues was filed with the Hearing Clerk, United States Department of Agriculture, on April 27, 1950 (15 F. R. 2493). Exceptions have been filed to that recommended decision and were considered in arriving at the findings and conclusions contained herein. The material exceptions are discussed specifically in the findings and conclusions with respect to the points to which such exceptions refer. However, to the extent that the findings and conclusions contained herein are at variance with any exception pertaining thereto, such exception is overruled.

The issue remaining to be decided from the March 1949 hearing concerned a proposed reduction of the Class I price for that Class I milk sold outside the Boston marketing area to the level of prices established for milk in a similar class under the New York milk order.

The material issues presented on the record of the public hearing held at

Boston, Massachusetts, January 30–February 1, 1950, were concerned with the following:

1. A decrease or increase in the price paid by handlers for Class II milk relative to the market prices of cream and nonfat solids.

2. Extension of the months when the pricing of butterfat made into butter and cheese is computed on the basis of butter value.

3. Designation of buttermilk, milk sold to food manufacturers, and whole milk packaged in hermetically sealed cans, as Class II instead of Class I milk.

4. Include processed Cheddar cheese in the types of cheese eligible for the lower Class II price.

5. A revision of the application of classification and payments provisions with respect to milk received from plants subject to the New York Federal milk order.

6. Revision of definitions to provide equal regulation of all handlers doing at least 10 percent of their business in fluid milk products in the Greater Boston marketing area.

7. Modification of assignment of receipts by pool handlers from producer-handlers and classification of milk disposed of to producer-handlers.

8. Reduction of payment required on nonpool milk received at city plants.

9. Minor revisions of the order language.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Findings with respect to March 16, 1949, hearing record. The following findings and conclusions on the material issue decided herein are made upon the record of the hearing held March 16 and 17, 1949.

The proposed reduction of the Class I price for that Class I milk sold outside the Boston marketing area to the level of prices established for such milk under the New York milk order should be denied.

One of the principal factors to be considered in deciding the issue pertains to the relative volumes of milk from New York and Boston handlers' plants which is sold in unregulated areas in which the handlers of these two markets compete for sales. Since the hearing on this issue, public hearings have been held and final action has been taken to make Federal milk orders effective in the Springfield and Worcester, Massachusetts, milk markets, two areas in which both Boston and New York handlers have sold fluid milk. These markets are now removed from unregulated territory in which Boston handlers must compete with New York handlers and unregulated handlers on a blend price basis for Class I (fluid) sales. Since the area of competition for sales of fluid milk in unregulated territory has been changed substantially in Massachusetts, no action should be taken on this proposal without a further hearing.

It is therefore concluded that no further amendment should be issued on the basis of the record of the hearing held March 16–17, 1949, at Boston and the aforesaid hearing be closed.

Findings with respect to January 30, 1950, hearing record. The following findings and conclusions on the material issues decided herein are made upon the record of the hearing held January 30–February 1, 1950.

1. *Class II price.* The price paid by handlers for Class II milk relative to the market prices of cream and nonfat solids should not be changed at this time.

The order now provides that the Class II price, except for Class II butterfat used to make butter or Cheddar cheese during certain months, shall be determined by a formula using market price quotations for cream and nonfat dry milk solids. The formula contains a schedule of amounts varying seasonally from 57.5 to 75.5 cents which are deducted in computing the hundredweight price. A group of operating cooperatives who are also handlers under the order proposed that each figure in the schedule be increased 17 cents. Producers would receive 17 cents less per hundredweight of Class II milk under the proposal.

In support of the proposal to reduce the Class II price by the 17-cent factor, it was contended that losses have been incurred in the handling of Class II milk during recent years. The proponents of the price reduction insisted that data collected by a committee studying the Class II price problem reveal substantial losses have been and are now being sustained by handlers. The committee report was submitted with the clear statement that the analyses were tentative and members of the committee would testify at the hearing to aid in interpretations of the material and to help avoid misleading conclusions. Certain members of the committee who are participating in the study testified that the data do not prove that losses were sustained in 1949 or are likely to be sustained in 1950.

In addition to the cost data prepared by the committee, proponents offered a summary of losses calculated for four manufacturing plants. The methods of cost and income computations for this summary were substantially the same as those used by the committee so that differences in computed cost items would be expected to reflect the differences in the operations at the 4 plants as compared to the 12 plants included in the committee study.

The methods of cost allocation and the assumptions concerning income which were used by the committee influence the end result materially. The committee members have indicated that they have not passed final judgment on the methods and assumptions and are not ready to draw conclusions from the data presented in this record. In view of the admission by the committee that the study of cost data has not been completed and their declaration of the intention to study further the significance of the figures shown, it would be illogical to draw from this record conclusions based on the committee's tentative findings which the committee itself regards as insufficient to provide a basis for conclusion.

Some of the objectives outlined by the committee as measures of a satisfactory Class II price may be used without direct reference to the cost data to measure whether prices have been too high or too low in the recent past. One objective states "The Class II prices should reflect to handlers and processors a sufficient operating margin to cover costs plus a competitive return on capital investment so as to insure their willingness to purchase all of the Class II milk offered for sale." This objective would imply that if cost plus a margin of earnings is not returned to handlers on Class II milk, handlers do not accept all of the Class II milk offered for sale by producers. There is no evidence in this record that handlers are generally leaving producers without a market for their milk. Handlers apparently were willing to accept all milk offered by producers in 1948 and 1949. As handlers pointed out in exceptions, once an investment is made in milk processing plants and equipment, the plant operator is likely to continue operations even at a loss if he is able to recover his out-of-pocket costs. This is particularly true if the operator foresees an early recovery of the temporary losses sustained. It appears that handlers regard the future margin with approval in view of their continued acceptance of Class II milk.

In the case of handlers who are also cooperative associations, the associations are obligated to accept all of the milk of their members. Producer members of the associations would be required to make up any losses suffered in the handling of surplus milk. Although there is some reference to deductions authorized by some cooperative associations, members there is no basis in this record to indicate that the claimed losses have been sustained by producer members of cooperative associations.

The record indicates that there are certain outlets for Class II milk in which Boston pool handlers have an advantage in freight and marketing opportunities over more distant manufacturers. These outlets are limited, it was claimed, and therefore as the total volume of Class II milk increases the proportion in the preferred outlets decreases and the quantity of Class II milk used in those products which yield the lowest return increases. Although the committee members did not agree on all phases of the report on cost data there was general agreement that the total volume of Class II milk handled affects substantially the unit cost of handling such milk. The volume of milk utilized in Class II products has been increasing recently and continued large quantities are expected to be handled in Class II operations this year. The declining unit costs associated with the increased volume tend to offset the claimed reduction in average unit returns.

The loss of sales by Boston handlers to New York handlers of skim milk to soft cheese makers was claimed by proponents of an increased handling allowance. Cheesemakers testified that they could purchase skim milk from New York handlers at a lower price than that at which Boston handlers were willing to sell. Apparently New York handlers attribute a larger part of the allowance factor to the handling of skim milk than

do Boston handlers. Moreover the quotation used to reflect skim milk values in the New York order less the freight allowance on powder has been generally lower in recent years than the quotation used in the Boston order.

Handlers offered no criticism of the quotation used in the Boston order as a measure of prices which they were able to obtain for nonfat dry milk solids. The fact that Boston handlers have refused to meet the lower skim milk prices at which New York handlers are offering the product may indicate more remunerative outlets than in the sale of the skim for soft cheese use.

The butterfat value factor used in computing the price for Class III milk under the New York order was higher in several months of 1949 than the butterfat value factor under the Boston order. The New York factor is based on butter prices whereas the Boston price is based on fluid cream prices. Fluid cream prices were unusually low in 1949 relative to butter prices. There is no clear indication in this record that the 1949 price relationship will be continued or that the prices will follow the pattern of previous years in which cream butterfat prices were at least as high as butterfat values based on the New York order surplus price formula. The net difference between Boston Class II prices and New York Class III prices is so small that there appears to be no basis for changing the Boston Class II price to meet competitive conditions.

Although the principal testimony centered around a proposed increase in the deduction factor used in the Class II formula, one proposal considered at the hearing was to change the factor 33.48 to 33 with a resultant increase in the Class II price. The factor 33.48 has been used to relate the value of butterfat in a can of 40 percent cream sold on the Boston market to the rate per pound of fat contained in Class II milk. Any revision of the factor affects the margin allowed to handlers of Class II milk and therefore must be considered in the light of the evidence on over-all margin. The evidence in this record failed to justify the reduction of the margin which is represented by this factor. The evidence indicates that 33 may be a more appropriate figure than 33.48 but the use of the figure 33 would require the development of another factor representing the value of fat lost in receiving milk and separating it into cream and skim milk. That factor is not determinable from this record but appears to be about equal to the present 0.48 factor. Without more definite information concerning the appropriate factor to substitute for 0.48, the factor should not be changed.

In consideration of the evidence in this record, it is concluded that the Class II price formula should not be changed at this time.

2. *Butter and cheese adjustment months.* The months of August and September should be added for 1950 only to the period in which the pricing of butterfat made into butter and cheese is computed on the basis of butter value.

One proposal considered at the hearing would have set up a year-round special price for butterfat used in making butter and Cheddar cheese. Another proposal would have extended the special pricing which is applicable during April, May, June, and July to other months depending on the relative supplies of surplus milk available to handlers on the quantity of fluid cream purchased from outside sources to supplement local cream.

The proponents of the year-round butter class cited the vagaries of milk production and milk and cream sales which give rise to a difficult problem of balancing the cream requirements of the region and the available local supplies of butterfat. This difficulty is not a new development in the market. Handlers of fluid cream have recognized the problem and representatives of handlers indicated that butterfat could be held in refrigeration for several days to offset the disparity in supplies and sales. The butter manufactured in the months August through March represents "route returns" to a considerable extent according to handlers. "Route returns" made into butter are considered a salvage operation which is charged against the cost of handling fluid milk and fluid cream.

Since the cost of making some butter in months other than those in which the special butter-cheese price applies has been recognized in the regular Class II price, any adjustment for the normal factors which give rise to butter making in those months would need to be offset in a compensating increase in the regular Class II price. This record shows no necessity for making such a change in the price plan. In view of the minor effect which such a change would have on handlers' cost of Class II milk with a calculated compensating adjustment, any revision of this factor should be deferred until the study committee reports completely on the problem.

Another proposal to alter the special price applicable to butter-cheese milk was offered by handlers. This proposal was designed to extend or contract from year to year the number of months in which the lower price applies. The proponents of this plan pointed to the changes from year to year in the amount of butterfat available from pool milk supplies. It was argued that as pool supplies increased beyond a given amount, Class II butterfat could not be entirely used in fluid cream and ice cream uses. The additional quantity beyond this given amount has to be made into butter or cheese, it was contended. The proponents of this idea admitted that estimates of the supply and the sales of butterfat in fluid form were subject to a considerable margin of error. It was argued, however, that some adjustment should be made in the application of the butter-cheese price to more months during seasons of relatively large Class II supplies and fewer months in short production years.

In addition to the difficulty of calculating when Class II supplies will continue above or below a certain percentage of total pool milk, past experience fails to support the premise that increased supplies of Class II milk necessarily mean that butter and cheese must be made in additional months. In April 1949 the volume of Class II milk increased 50 percent over the previous April but the butterfat subject to the butter-cheese adjustment declined 14 percent. The July 1949 Class II milk was 11½ percent above the Class II volume in July 1948 but the butter-cheese adjustment applied to 8 percent less butterfat. Both May and June 1949 showed increases in Class II volume and increases in butterfat subject to the butter-cheese adjustment compared to the same months of the previous year. These comparisons tend to indicate that handlers may have shifted to pool supplies of butterfat for cream to a larger extent in 1949 than in 1948. Many factors may have been influential in the shift. This comparison is too limited to discount entirely the influence of volume of Class II milk as a factor in determining the need for an extended butter-cheese price. It does indicate the volume of Class II alone is not a dependable measure of the need for a special butter-cheese price.

The record indicates that the volume of Class II milk will probably be relatively large during 1950. If fluid cream and ice cream sales do not absorb the available butterfat, some part of the supply may need to be made into butter and cheese after July 31. In view of this possibility the special pricing for butter and cheese milk should be extended to August and September for this year only. The allowance for handling Class II milk whether for butter and cheese or for other Class II products is established at 6 cents per hundredweight less in August and September than in April and July and 12 cents less in May and June. This smaller handling allowance should operate as some curb on unwarranted manufacture of butter and cheese in these months.

3. *Designation of certain products as Class II instead of Class I.* Whole milk sold to industrial manufacturers of soup, candy, or bakery products and milk disposed of in the form of buttermilk should continue to be Class I products. Milk processed and packaged in hermetically sealed containers should continue to be designated as Class I until more information is available concerning the product.

Industrial manufacturers of soup, candy, and bakery products have continued to purchase their requirements for milk solids, both fat and nonfat in the form of dairy products even though solids in the form of fluid skim milk and cream would apparently be cheaper. Under the present price basis fluid skim milk and cream are priced at a level which assumes that some processing costs will apply to the skim milk at least, whereas soup, candy, and bakery products manufacturers can use the fluid milk products in raw fluid form. The additional freight cost in disposing of fluid skim milk offsets in part the saving on processing cost if the milk is shipped to the marketing area. No such offset exists in the case of sales to manufacturers in the production area. The proposal would extend to whole milk which has not incurred even separating costs, a price which reflects the usual processing requirements. The sponsors of this revision in classification argued that the

proposed pricing would permit Boston handlers to offer whole milk to manufacturers of soup, candy, and bakery products at a favorable price compared to that charged for fluid cream and nonfat milk solids in the form of skim powder or condensed products.

The method of pricing Class II milk in the Boston market recognizes the fact that Class II products must compete for outlets with milk, cream and dairy products from other parts of the country. The proposed lower pricing for whole milk sold to industrial users involves a considerable departure from the concept of meeting the competitive price based on milk fat solids and nonfat solids available to such users in the form of manufactured dairy products. Such an important revision of price policy should not be adopted without more complete examination of its implications than this record provides. Consequently, no change should be made in the classification of whole milk sold to soup, candy and bakery products manufacturers on the basis of this record.

The proposal to classify buttermilk in Class II instead of Class I was supported as a means of increasing sales of that product. The representative of handlers who advanced this proposal stated that he had no basis of judging whether the increased sales would be likely to represent additional sales or substitution for other Class I products. The lower price was requested principally because buttermilk is a small-volume sales item and therefore carries considerable sales expense per unit. There is no evidence in this record to support the classification of buttermilk as a Class II product along with products on which the same standards for sanitary milk production are not imposed.

The evidence in the record is incomplete concerning a canned whole milk product which a manufacturer proposed to process for sale in export markets. The product has not yet been manufactured in the area and limited information is available concerning it. The product is represented as similar in storability and market outlets to evaporated milk and dry milk products which are now included in Class II. The regulations by health departments governing the manufacture and sales of the product cannot be predicted from the information available at this time.

The record does not show clearly the influence of freight costs on the price a handler could afford to pay for the milk used in the product. If sales outlets are more readily available at Eastern shipping points than from Midwest areas, the price for milk used in canned milk should be adjusted for that factor. Since the product would have all of the bulk of whole milk, the freight factor is significant. It is impossible to determine from this record whether the manufacturer would be prohibited from manufacturing the product at the Class I price. The record does show that the present Class II price would not reflect any freight advantage.

4. *Butterfat used in processed Cheddar cheese.* The special pricing for butterfat used in butter and Cheddar cheese during April, May, June, and July should apply also to Cheddar cheese which is later made into processed Cheddar cheese. Processed Cheddar cheese is similar to Cheddar cheese in its natural characteristics such as bulkiness, perishability, sanitary standards and the competition of a Nation-wide market. The record indicates no basis for differentiating in the pricing of fat made into Cheddar cheese and fat made into processed Cheddar cheese.

5. *Receipts from New York order plants.* Milk classified under the New York order in any class other than I–A or I–B should be assigned to Class II.

The Class I price under the Boston order and the Class I–A or I–B prices under the New York order are approximately equal at the same distance from each market. Because of differences in classification and accounting methods in the two markets it has been possible for milk priced in lower priced classes under the New York order to be sold in the Boston marketing area as Class I milk without paying the Class I price to either New York or Boston producers. The revision would limit the quantity which could receive a Class I assignment under the Boston order to the milk which was classified and priced under the New York order in the classes which are priced on a basis generally equivalent to Class I in Boston.

It was proposed also at the hearing that on Class I milk received from New York plants the receiving handler pay into the producer settlement fund any difference between the applicable price under the New York order and the price under the Boston order if the Boston price is higher.

The proponents of this payment into the Boston producer fund failed to cite any real or potential instance in which New York prices for Class I–A and I–B would be so far out of line with Boston Class I prices as to offer any incentive to substitute New York pool milk for Boston pool milk. The variations are likely to be offsetting from month to month. It is, therefore, concluded from this record that the regulation of the Boston order should not be encumbered with safeguards against economic dangers that are not yet in sight.

6. *Regulation of handlers based on percentage of their total sales made in the marketing area.* The order should be amended to limit the privileges of classification accorded to regulated plants to the bottling or processing plants of a buyer-handler only if he has sales in the marketing area totaling more than 10 percent of his receipts of fluid milk products. Any other plants of a handler whose entire supply of fluid milk products is received from other handlers would thus become unregulated plants. Class I disposition in the marketing area directly to consumers from such unregulated plants may be offset by purchases from pool handlers but Class I disposed of to other handlers in the marketing area cannot be offset by purchases of pool milk in order to avoid the payment required on outside milk.

In order to dispose of more than 10 percent of his total fluid milk products in the marketing area without acquiring the status of a regulated plant, the handler who receives his entire supply of milk from other handlers would have to make disposition from a plant which is not a processing or bottling plant directly to consumers. No such handler's plant was described in the record.

Another proposal on the same issue was intended apparently to make regulated plants all plants with Class I sales in the marketing area equal to more than 10 percent of their total receipts of fluid milk products. There are several exceptions to this rule, such as plants subject to the New York order, producer-handler plants and plants which are designated as nonpool at the request of the handler or are unable to qualify for pooling during the flush production season. In view of the complex nature of the determination of the regulated status of a plant and the limited development of the problems in this record, only the operations described as presently existing should be modified as the result of this hearing.

7. *Assignment of receipts from and sales to dairy farmer-dealers.* Receipts by a pool handler from a dairy farmer who is also a dealer should be considered outside milk to the extent that the dairy farmer-dealer has received any outside milk at his plant during the month. Fluid milk products disposed of to a dairy farmer-dealer who sells Class I milk in the marketing area should continue to be classified under the rules for classifying such products moved to regulated plants.

The provisions of the order which permit a dairy farmer-dealer to dispose of milk to a handler on the same basis as a producer should not apply to a dairy farmer-dealer who is purchasing milk not subject to the minimum prices of the order. The requirement that sales to pool handlers be considered outside milk, to the extent that the dairy farmer-dealer has received outside milk, is necessary to prevent the acquisition of outside milk by handlers in the area without the payment required on such milk. The order already provides that dairy farmer-dealers who dispose of Class I milk in the marketing area make the payments on outside milk on this basis although such payments are made directly to the producer settlement fund.

With respect to the classification of milk disposed of to producer-handlers, defined as dairy farmer-dealers who dispose of Class I milk in the marketing area, the record indicates no basis for a change in the regulations. The arguments for revision indicated that the proposed limitation on the classification of milk moved to producer-handlers would offset certain advantages which it was claimed that producer-handlers enjoy in disposing of milk to pool handlers. The record indicates that producer-handlers who receive milk from pool handlers are not always the same producer-handlers who dispose of milk to pool handlers. An offset penalty does not appear to be an appropriate remedy for the complaint.

8. *Outside milk received at city plants.* No change should be made in the computation of the payment to the pro-

ducer settlement fund on outside milk received at city plants from other plants.

The record indicates that movements of outside milk to pool plants are made principally in the months when the Class II milk at pool plants is greatest.

During these months the Boston order provides a special lower price for butterfat used in butter and cheese. The record indicates that handlers have no need to purchase additional nonpool butterfat when they are manufacturing butter. Therefore, it appears that the movement of nonpool milk to pool plants during the flush season months in which it moves, is done for the convenience of the handler having the outside milk and no better method for disposition. It is not reasonable for the Boston pool to acquire such nonpool milk without a payment sufficient to offset the loss to the pool by reason of the classification in a lower price use of the pool milk which is replaced. The relationship between the payment on outside milk and the special lower pricing for pool milk used at the same time in butter and cheese was not considered in full on the record because the hearing notice did not call attention to the need for reconsideration of the classification of outside milk received by handlers when there is a special low price established for Class II milk disposed of in butter and cheese.

The record does indicate that the two issues are closely related. Therefore, no change should be made in this provision without an opportunity to consider the effect upon the classification and pricing of producer milk.

The handler who proposed the change in the computation of the payment on outside milk excepted to the finding on this issue on the grounds that outside milk provides a saving to the producer fund which more than compensates for any possible loss through lower priced use of producer milk. Any saving to the producer fund would be accomplished only if the plant from which outside milk is moved to a city plant is nearer to the city than the alternative source of milk if the outside milk were not purchased. The quantity of milk available at plants in nearby zones for Class I use but not so classified is greatest during the flush season months. It is not at all certain, therefore, that a saving would be accomplished for the producer fund.

9. *Minor revisions.* Several minor revisions of order language were described at the public hearing. The revisions dealt principally with the deletion of obsolete words and phrases. Each of the proposed revisions should be adopted as set forth in the hearing notice.

General findings. (a) The proposed marketing agreement and the order, as amended, and as hereby proposed to be further amended, and all of the terms and conditions thereof will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act.

(b) The parity prices of milk as determined pursuant to section 2 of the act are not reasonable in view of the price of feeds, available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply of and demand for milk in the marketing area and the minimum prices specified in the proposed marketing agreement and the order, as amended, and as hereby proposed to be further amended, are such prices as will reflect the aforesaid factors, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest; and

(c) The proposed order, as amended, and as hereby proposed to be further amended, will regulate the handling of milk in the same manner as, and will be applicable only to persons in the respective classes of industrial and commercial activity specified in a marketing agreement upon which a hearing has been held.

Determination of representative period. The month of November 1949 is hereby determined to be the representative period for the purpose of ascertaining whether the issuance of an order amending the order, as amended, regulating the handling of milk in the Greater Boston, Massachusetts, marketing area in the manner set forth in the attached amending order is approved or favored by producers who during such period were engaged in the production of milk for sale in the marketing area specified in such marketing order, as amended.

Annexed hereto and made a part hereof are two documents entitled respectively "Marketing Agreement Regulating the Handling of Milk in the Greater Boston, Massachusetts, Marketing Area," and "Order Amending the Order, as Amended, Regulating the Handling of Milk in the Greater Boston, Massachusetts, Marketing Area," which have been decided upon as the detailed and appropriate means of effectuating the foregoing conclusions. These documents shall not become effective unless and until the requirements of § 900.14 of the rules of practice and procedure, as amended, governing proceedings to formulate marketing agreements and orders have been met.

It is hereby ordered, That all of this decision, except the attached marketing agreement, be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. The regulatory provisions of said marketing agreement are identical with those contained in the order, as amended, and as hereby proposed to be further amended by the attached order which will be published with this decision.

This decision filed at Washington, D. C., this 23d day of June 1950.

[SEAL] CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture.

Order[1] Amending the Order, as Amended, Regulating the Handling of Milk in Greater Boston, Mass., Marketing Area

§ 904.0 *Findings and determinations.* The findings and determinations hereinafter set forth are supplementary and in addition to the findings and determinations previously made in connection with the issuance of the aforesaid order and of each of the previously issued amendments thereto; and all of said previous findings and determinations are hereby ratified and affirmed, except insofar as such findings and determinations may be in conflict with the findings and determinations set forth herein.

(a) *Findings upon the basis of the hearing record.* Pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 601 et seq.), and the applicable rules of practice and procedure, as amended, governing the formulation of marketing agreements and marketing orders (7 CFR, Part 900), a public hearing was held upon certain proposed amendments to the tentative marketing agreement and to the order, as amended, regulating the handling of milk in the Greater Boston, Massachusetts, marketing area. Upon the basis of the evidence introduced at such hearing and the record thereof, it is found that:

(1) The said order, as amended, and as hereby further amended, and all of the terms and conditions thereof, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act;

(2) The parity prices of milk as determined pursuant to section 2 of the act are not reasonable in view of the price of feeds, available supplies of feeds and other economic conditions which affect market supplies of and demand for milk in the marketing area, and the minimum prices specified in the order, as amended, and as hereby further amended, are such prices as will reflect the aforesaid factors, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk and be in the public interest; and

(3) The said order, as amended, and as hereby further amended, regulates the handling of milk in the same manner as and is applicable only to persons in the respective classes of industrial and commercial activity specified in a marketing agreement upon which a hearing has been held.

ORDER RELATIVE TO HANDLING

It is therefore ordered, That on and after the effective date hereof the handling of milk in the Greater Boston, Massachusetts, marketing area shall be in conformity to and in compliance with the terms and conditions of the aforesaid order, as amended, and as hereby further amended, and the aforesaid order, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows;

1. Revise § 904.1 (b) (9) to read as follows:

(9) "Buyer-handler" means any handler who operates a bottling or processing plant from which more than 10 percent of his total receipts of fluid milk products other than cream are disposed of by him as Class I milk in the marketing area, and whose entire supply of fluid milk products is received from other handlers.

2. Revise § 904.1 (d) (6) (ii) to read as follows:

(ii) All fluid milk products, other than cream, received at a regulated plant from an unregulated plant, up to the total quantity of nonpool milk received at the unregulated plant; except that receipts

[1] This order shall not become effective unless and until the requirements of § 900.14 of the rules of practice and procedure, as amended, governing proceedings to formulate marketing agreements and orders have been met.

from a New York order pool plant which are assigned to Class I milk pursuant to § 904.5 (e) and receipts of emergency milk shall not be considered outside milk; and

3. Revise § 904.5 (e) to read as follows:

(e) *Receipt from New York order pool plants.* Receipts of fluid milk products from New York order pool plants shall be assigned to Class II milk, except as provided in paragraph (f) of this section, and except that receipts during the months of August through March which are classified in Class I–A or I–B under the New York order shall be assigned to Class I milk.

4. Revise the first sentence of § 904.6 (h) to read as follows:

(h) *Retention of records.* All books and records required under this order to be made available to the market administrator shall be retained by the handler for a period of three years to begin at the end of the calendar month to which such books and records pertain: *Provided*, That if, within such three-year period, the market administrator notifies the handler in writing that the retention of such books and records, or of specified books and records, is necessary in connection with a proceeding under section 8c (15) (A) of the act or a court action specified in such notice, the handler shall retain such books and records, until further written notification from the market administrator.

5. In § 904.7 (e) after the words "During the months of April, May, June and July" insert the words "of any year, and during August and September of 1950."

6. Revise § 904.7 (e) (4) to read as follows:

(4) Subtract such portion of the quantity determined in subparagraph (3) of this paragraph as was made into salted butter and disposed of by the handler or such second person in a form other than salted butter.

7. In §§ 904.7 (a) (6) and (7) delete the words "For any month after December 1948".

8. In § 904.7 (d) change the reference from M No. 5 to M No. 6.

9. In § 904.8 (b) (7) change the second sentence to read as follows: "This result, which is the minimum blended price for milk containing 3.7 percent butterfat received from producers at plants located in the 201–210 freight mileage zone, shall be known as the basic blended price."

10. Revise § 904.9 (b) to read as follows:

(b) *Final payments.* Each pool handler shall make payment for the total value of milk received during such month as required to be computed pursuant to § 904.8 (a), as follows:

(1) On or before the 25th day after the end of each month to each producer at not less than the basic blended price per hundredweight, subject to the differentials provided in paragraphs (d) and (e) of this section, for the quantity of milk delivered by such producer; and

(2) To producers, through the market administrator, by paying to, on or before the 23d day after the end of each month, or receiving from the market administrator, on or before the 25th day after the end of each month, as the case may be, the amount by which the payments at the basic blended price adjusted by the plant and farm location differentials provided in paragraph (e) of this section are less than or exceed the value of milk as required to be computed for each such handler pursuant to § 904.8 (a), as shown in a statement rendered by the market administrator on or before the 20th day after the end of such month.

[F. R. Doc. 50–5551; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:50 a. m.]

[7 CFR, Part 992]

IRISH POTATOES GROWN IN WASHINGTON

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING WITH RESPECT TO REGULATION OF SHIPMENTS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JULY 17, 1950, THROUGH MAY 31, 1951

Consideration is being given to the following recommendation, submitted by the State of Washington Potato Committee, established pursuant to Marketing Agreement No. 113 and Order No. 92 (14 F. R. 5860), regulating the handling of Irish Potatoes grown in the State of Washington, issued under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (48 Stat. 31, as amended; 7 U. S. C. 601 et seq.; 61 Stat. 202, 707; 62 Stat. 1247; 63 Stat. 1051).

(1) During the period beginning July 17, 1950, and ending May 31, 1951, no handler shall ship potatoes grown in the State of Washington which do not meet the requirements of the U. S. No. 2 or better grade and which are of sizes smaller than 2 inches minimum diameter and/or 4 ounces minimum weight, as such grade and sizes are defined in the United States Standards for Potatoes (14 F. R. 1955, 2161), including the tolerances specified therein: *Provided*, That, pursuant to paragraphs (a) and (b) of § 992.5, the aforesaid limitations shall not be applicable to (i) shipments of potatoes for export; (ii) shipments of potatoes for distribution by the Federal Government, for distribution by relief agencies, or for consumption by charitable institutions; (iii) shipments of potatoes for manufacturing or conversion into byproducts; (iv) shipments of potatoes for livestock feed; (v) shipments of officially certified seed potatoes: *Provided further*, That, pursuant to § 992.5 (c), each handler making shipments for the aforesaid purposes shall file an application with the committee to do so, shall pay assessments on such shipments, and shall have such shipments (except officially certified seed potato shipments) inspected in connection therewith: *Provided further*, That, pursuant to § 992.4 (d) each handler may make one shipment of not in excess of five (5) hundredweight of potatoes per week without regard to the aforesaid limitations.

(2) The terms used herein shall have the same meaning as when used in Marketing Agreement No. 113 and Order No. 92 (14 F. R. 5860).

All persons who desire to submit written data, views, or arguments for consideration in connection with the aforesaid proposal may do so by submitting the same to the Director, Fruit and Vegetable Branch, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D. C., not later than the 7th day following publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

(48 Stat. 31 as amended; 7 U. S. C. 601 et seq.; 61 Stat. 202, 707; 62 Stat. 1247; 63 Stat. 1051)

Done at Washington, D. C., this 23d day of June 1950.

[SEAL] S. R. SMITH,
Director,
Fruit and Vegetable Branch.

[F. R. Doc. 50–5541; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:49 a. m.]

NOTICES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Electrification Administration

[Administrative Order 2759]

MONTANA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 6, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Montana 36C Lincoln	$175,000

[SEAL] CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50–5552; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:50 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2760]

SOUTH DAKOTA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 6, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation: South Dakota 19F Turner — Amount $485,000

[SEAL] CLAUDE R. WICKARD, *Administrator.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5553; Filed, June 27, 19[illegible]; 8:50 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2761]

INDIANA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 6, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation: Indiana 59M Wayne — Amount $75,000

[SEAL] CLAUDE R. WICKARD, *Administrator.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5554; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:50 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2762]

ALABAMA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 6, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation: Alabama 23M Pike — Amount $500,000

[SEAL] CLAUDE R. WICKARD, *Administrator.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5555; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:51 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2763]

TENNESSEE

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 6, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation: Tennessee 37G Hawkins — Amount $245,000

[SEAL] CLAUDE R. WICKARD, *Administrator.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5556; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:51 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2764]

NEBRASKA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 6, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation: Nebraska 95D, E Cheyenne — Amount $632,000

[SEAL] CLAUDE R. WICKARD, *Administrator.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5557; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:51 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2765]

MONTANA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 9, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation: Montana 28E McCone — Amount $385,000

[SEAL] CLAUDE R. WICKARD, *Administrator.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5558; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:51 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2766]

NORTH CAROLINA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 9, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation: North Carolina 23AB Caldwell — Amount $566,000

[SEAL] CLAUDE R. WICKARD, *Administrator.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5559; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:51 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2767]

MINNESOTA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 9, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation: Minnesota 83N Hubbard — Amount $315,000

[SEAL] CLAUDE R. WICKARD, *Administrator.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5560; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:51 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2768]

TEXAS

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 9, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation: Texas 62L Bailey — Amount $100,000

[SEAL] CLAUDE R. WICKARD, *Administrator.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5561; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:51 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2769]

NORTH CAROLINA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation: North Carolina 23AC Caldwell — Amount $200,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE, *Acting Administrator.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5562; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:51 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2770]

KENTUCKY

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation: Kentucky 21S Nelson — Amount $300,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE, *Acting Administrator.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5563; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:51 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2771]

SOUTH DAKOTA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
South Dakota 12N Minnehaha	$180,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5564; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:51 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2772]

NEW MEXICO

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
New Mexico 11L Taos	$30,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5565; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:52 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2773]

WYOMING

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Wyoming 12F Park	$180,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5566; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:52 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2774]

KENTUCKY

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Kentucky 50P Graves	$345,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5567; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:52 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2775]

IOWA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Iowa 43R Greene	$155,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5568; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:52 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2776]

GEORGIA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Georgia 97G Dooly	$100,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5569; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:52 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2777]

ALABAMA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Alabama 46D Franklin	$120,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5570; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:52 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2778]

MISSOURI

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Missouri 33W Butler	$740,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5571; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:52 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2779]

MICHIGAN

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Michigan 42M Mason	$320,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5572; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:52 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2780]

FLORIDA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Florida 28N Madison	$210,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5573; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:52 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2781]

INDIANA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Ad-

ministrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Indiana 38H Johnson	$250,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5574; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2782]

INDIANA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Indiana 83K Dubois	$335,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5575; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2783]

IOWA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Iowa 27N Buena Vista	$103,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5576; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2784]

TEXAS

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Texas 98L Young	$165,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5577; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2785]

WISCONSIN

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Wisconsin 46M Lafayette	$102,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5578; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2786]

ARIZONA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Arizona 22C Kingman	$95,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5579; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2787]

ALASKA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Alaska 5C Kenai	$14,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5580; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2788]

MINNESOTA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Minnesota 54G Faribault	$145,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. A. Doc. 50-5581; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2789]

NEW MEXICO

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
New Mexico 8P Roosevelt	$390,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5582; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2790]

ARKANSAS

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Arkansas 15U Woodruff	$275,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5583; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2791]

MICHIGAN

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Michigan 37N Huron	$665,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5584; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2792]

OREGON

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	Amount
Oregon 14N Umatilla	$660,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5585; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2793]

NORTH DAKOTA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	Amount
North Dakota 8T Benson	$10,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5586; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2794]

TENNESSEE

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	Amount
Tennessee 1X Meigs	$520,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5587; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2795]

TENNESSEE

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Adminstration:

Loan designation:	Amount
Tennessee 25L Jackson	$695,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5588; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2796]

ALABAMA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 12, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	Amount
Alabama 29H Greene	$1,485,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5589; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2797]

WISCONSIN

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 13, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	Amount
Wisconsin 57S Rusk	$130,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5590; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:53 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2798]

MINNESOTA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 13, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	Amount
Minnesota 72H Renville	$195,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5591; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2799]

NORTH DAKOTA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 13, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	Amount
North Dakota 33E Stark	$725,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5592; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2800]

OHIO

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 13, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	Amount
Ohio 32T Belmont	$240,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5593; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2801]

IOWA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 13, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	Amount
Iowa 57K Mitchell	$226,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5594; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2802]

KENTUCKY

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 13, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the

Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Kentucky 58K Floyd	$210,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5595; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2803]

MONTANA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 13, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Montana 16H Park	$100,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5596; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2804]

ALABAMA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 13, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Alabama 9R Clarke-Washington	$565,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5597; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2805]

MISSOURI

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 13, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Missouri 31N, P Mississippi	$525,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5598; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2806]

SOUTH CAROLINA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 13, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
South Carolina 14X Aiken	$940,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5599; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2807]

NEBRASKA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 13, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Nebraska 92D Sheridan	$414,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5600; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2808]

INDIANA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 13, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Indiana 15L Fayette	$65,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5601; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2809]

FLORIDA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 13, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Florida 25K, L Lee	$475,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5602; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2810]

ILLINOIS

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 13, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Illinois 2P Wayne	$844,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5603; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2811]

INDIANA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 13, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Indiana 89P Harrison	$215,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5604; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2812]

OKLAHOMA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 14, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Oklahoma 16P, S Pontotoc	$975,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5605; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2813]

NEW MEXICO

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 14, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
New Mexico 20H Socorro	$50,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5606; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2814]

MONTANA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 14, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Montana 12L Missoula	$190,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5607; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2815]

IOWA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 14, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Iowa 61M Cherokee	$70,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5608; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2816]

NEW MEXICO

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 14, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
New Mexico 26B Union	$860,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5609; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2817]

WASHINGTON

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 14, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Washington 18P Spokane	$285,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5610; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2818]

OKLAHOMA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 14, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Oklahoma 33L Latimer	$620,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5611; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2819]

TEXAS

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 14, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Texas 56P Lubbock	$735,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5612; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2820]

NEBRASKA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 14, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Nebraska 2C Gering District Public	$78,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5613; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:55 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2821]

MINNESOTA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 14, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Minnesota 62R Wright	$160,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5614; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:55 a. m.]

[Administrative Order 2822]

INDIANA

LOAN ANNOUNCEMENT

JUNE 14, 1950.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, a loan contract bearing the following designation has been signed on behalf of the Government acting through the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

Loan designation:	*Amount*
Indiana 80F Noble	$260,000

[SEAL] WM. C. WISE,
Acting Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5615; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:55 a. m.]

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Wage and Hour Division

MINIMUM WAGE RATES FOR EMPLOYEES IN VARIOUS INDUSTRIES IN PUERTO RICO

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE SPECIAL INDUSTRY COMMITTEE NO. 8 FOR PUERTO RICO FOR PURPOSE OF RECEIVING EVIDENCE TO BE CONSIDERED IN RECOMMENDATION

In conformity with sections 5 and 8 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938,

as amended (52 Stat. 1060 as amended; 29 U. S. C., and Sup., 201 et seq.), and in accordance with § 511.11 of the regulations issued pursuant thereto (Title 29, Chapter V, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 511), notice is hereby given to all interested persons that a public hearing will be held beginning on July 18, 1950, at 10:00 a. m., in Room 412, New York Department Store Building, Stop 16½, Ponce de Leon Avenue, Santurce, Puerto Rico, for the purpose of receiving evidence to be considered by Special Industry Committee No. 8 for Puerto Rico in recommending minimum wage rates for employees in the industries in Puerto Rico hereinafter enumerated.

Special Industry Committee No. 8 for Puerto Rico was created by Administrative Order No. 399, to be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on June 20, 1950. It is charged, in accordance with the provisions of the of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and regulations promulgated thereunder, with the duty of investigating conditions in the following industries of Puerto Rico, as defined in said Administrative Order: the Hooked Rug Industry; Leather, Leather Goods and Related Products Industry; Handicraft Products Industry; Men's and Boys' Clothing and Related Products Industry; and the Needlework and Fabricated Textile Products Industry.

The Committee is further charged with the duty of recommending to the Administrator the highest minimum wage rates, (not in excess of 75 cents per hour) for all employees in Puerto Rico in the industries cited above who within the meaning of said act are "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce," excepting employees exempted by the provisions of section 13 (a) and employees coming under the provisions of section 14, which, having due regard to economic and competitive conditions, will not substantially curtail employment in such industries and will not give any industry in Puerto Rico a competitive advantage over any industry in the United States outside of Puerto Rico. Before any minimum wage rates recommended by the Committee are made effective, a public hearing will be held pursuant to section 8 of the act, at a time and place to be announced by the Administrator and at which all interested persons will have an opportunity to be heard.

Any person who, in the opinion of the Committee or its duly authorized subcommittee, has a substantial interest in the proceeding and is prepared to present material pertinent to the question under consideration, may appear on his own behalf or on behalf of any other person. Persons wishing to appear are requested to file with Russell Sturgis, Territorial Director of the Wage and Hour Division, Post Office Box 3906, Santurce 29, Puerto Rico, not later than July 11, 1950, a notice of intention to appear. A copy of such notice must also be filed by such persons with the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, United States Department of Labor, Washington 25, D. C., on or before the same date. The notice of intention to appear should contain the following information:

1. The name and address of the person appearing.

2. If he is appearing in a representative capacity, the name and address of the person or persons whom, or the organization which, he is representing.

3. The approximate length of time which his presentation will consume.

All testimony will be taken under oath and subject to reasonable cross-examination by any interested person present. Testimony so received will be offered as evidence at the public hearing to be held on such minimum wage recommendations as Special Industry Committee No. 8 for Puerto Rico may make.

Written statements of persons who cannot appear personally will be considered by the Committee provided that such statements are sworn and that at least 12 copies thereof are received not later than July 18, 1950, at the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor, Room 412, New York Department Store Building, Stop 16½ Ponce de Leon Avenue, Santurce, 29, Puerto Rico. Any person appearing at the hearing who offers written material must submit at least 12 copies thereof.

Signed at San Juan, Puerto Rico, this 20th day of June 1950.

A. CECIL SNYDER,
Chairman, Special Industry Committee No. 8 for Puerto Rico.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5616; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:55 a. m.]

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 7945, 7946]

JOHNSTON BROADCASTING CO. AND PILOT BROADCASTING CORP. (WTNB)

ORDER CONTINUING HEARING

In re applications of George Johnston and George Johnston, Jr., d/b as Johnston Broadcasting Company, Birmingham, Alabama, Docket No. 7945, File No. BP-5016; Pilot Broadcasting Corporation (WTNB), Birmingham, Alabama, Docket No. 7946, File No. BP-5332; for construction permits.

The Commission having under consideration a motion filed on June 16, 1950, by George Johnston and George Johnston, Jr., d/b as Johnston Broadcasting Company, and the Pilot Broadcasting Corporation, requesting that the hearing on the above-entitled applications now scheduled to be held in Washington, D. C., on June 22, 1950, be continued for a period of at least thirty days; and

It appearing, that the applicants in the above-entitled proceeding have been attempting to negotiate some form of amicable adjustment of their differences for submission to the Commission for approval; that there does not remain sufficient time prior to the date now scheduled for the said hearing to permit the said applicants to fully and properly explore the possibilities of such settlement; and that the said motion does not definitely indicate the amount of time which would be required for that purpose; and

It further appearing, that all of the parties to the proceeding have consented to the continuance as requested and to a waiver of § 1.745 of the Commission's rules relating to the time for the filing of motions; and

It further appearing, that the Hearing Examiner now assigned to preside in the above-entitled proceeding will be absent from the city of Washington, D. C., from about the middle of July until after September 8, 1950;

It is ordered, This 20th day of June 1950, that the motion be, and it is hereby, granted in part, and that the hearing on the above-entitled applications is hereby continued until 10:00 a. m., Monday, September 11, 1950, at Washington, D. C.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
[SEAL] T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5627; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:56 a. m.]

[Docket Nos. 9334, 9574]

COASTAL BROADCASTING CO. (WHIT) AND COMMONWEALTH BROADCASTING CORP. (WELS)

ORDER ADVANCING HEARING DATE

In re applications of Coastal Broadcasting Company (WHIT), New Bern, North Carolina, Docket No. 9334, File No. BP-7208; Commonwealth Broadcasting Corporation, Kinston, North Carolina (WELS), Docket No. 9574, File No. BMP-4917; for construction-permit and modification of CP.

The Commission having under consideration a petition filed June 1, 1950, on behalf of Commonwealth Broadcasting Corporation (WELS) requesting that the hearing date in this case be changed from September 26, 1950, to a date during the week of July 10, 1950; and

It appearing, that the hearing in this proceeding has been heretofore variously scheduled in 1950 on May 8, July 26 and September 26, the last date having been ordered "On the Commission's own motion" by the Hearing Examiner formerly designated to preside herein; and

It further appearing, that the week of July 10 is not satisfactory because of the Hearing Examiner's previously assigned hearing duties; and

It further appearing, that no pleading in opposition to the instant petition has been filed, and that the respective attorneys for each applicant, for the respondent and for the Commission have informally consented to a grant of the petition to the extent hereinafter ordered; now therefore,

It is ordered, This 16th day of June 1950, that the petition of Commonwealth Broadcasting Corporation for advance of the hearing date herein is granted, and the date of hearing at Washington, D. C., in this proceeding is hereby changed

from September 26, 1950, to August 9, 1950.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
[SEAL] T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5622; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:56 a. m.]

[Docket No. 9362]

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT ET AL.

ORDER CONTINUING HEARING

In the matter of International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and International Monetary Fund, complainants *v.* All American Cables and Radio, Inc., the Commercial Cable Company, Mackay Radio and Telegraph Company, Inc., RCA Communications, Inc., and the Western Union Telegraph Company, defendants; Docket No. 9362.

The Commission having under consideration a communication from The Western Union Telegraph Company, All America Cables and Radio, Inc., The Commercial Cable Company, and Mackay Radio and Telegraph Company, Inc., received June 16, 1950, requesting that the hearing herein, presently scheduled for June 20, 1950, in Washington, D. C., be continued to a later date; and

It appearing that this continuance is requested on the ground that the defendant carriers were served on June 16, 1950, with copies of the complainants' supplemental complaint, and that additional time is required for action to be taken on the supplemental complaint; and

It further appearing that the complainants have no objection to the continuance, but requests that the hearing, if continued, commence not earlier than October 15, 1950; and

It further appearing that there is no objection to the continuance by the other parties to the proceeding or by the Counsel for the Commission;

It is ordered, This 19th day of June 1950, that the request is hereby granted, and the hearing is hereby continued to October 17, 1950, at 10:00 a. m., in Washington, D. C.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
[SEAL] T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5620; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:56 a. m.]

[Docket Nos. 9439, 9611]

WEST TEXAS BROADCASTERS, INC. AND TUL'E BROADCASTING CO.

ORDER CONTINUING HEARING

In re applications of West Texas Broadcasters, Incorporated, Floydada, Texas, Docket No. 9611, File No. BP-7222; Francis David Burgess, Robert Olin Lowery, Francis J. Burgess, Allan S. Heard, Walker B. Jones and R. F. McCasland, d/b as Tul'e Broadcasting Company, Tulia, Texas, Docket No. 9439; File No. BP-7276; for construction permits.

The Commission having under consideration a petition filed June 13, 1950, by Francis David Burgess, Robert Olin Lowery, Francis J. Burgess, Allan S. Heard, Walker B. Jones and R. F. McCasland, d/b as Tul'e Broadcasting Company, Tulia, Texas, requesting that the hearing on the above-entitled matter, now scheduled for June 21, 1950, in Washington, D. C., be continued for a period of thirty days;

It appearing that the time within which opposition to said petition might have been filed has expired, and opposition thereto has not been filed by the other party to this proceeding nor by Commission Counsel; that good and sufficient cause for the requested continuance has been shown in the petition; and that public interest, convenience and necessity would be served by a grant of said petition;

It is ordered, This 19th day of June 1950, that the aforesaid petition be and it is hereby granted, and the hearing in the above-entitled proceeding be and it is hereby continued to August 1, 1950, at 10:00 a. m.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
[SEAL] T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5621; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:56 a. m.]

[Docket Nos. 9479, 9667]

NEWS JOURNAL CORP. (WNBD) AND RALPH D. EPPERSON (WPAQ)

ORDER CONTINUING HEARING

In re applications of News Journal Corporation (WNBD), Daytona Beach, Florida, Docket No. 9667, File No. BP-6983; Ralph D. Epperson (WPAQ), Mount Airy, North Carolina, Docket No. 9479, File No. BP-7153; for construction permits.

The Commission having under consideration a petition requesting a 60-day continuance of the hearing herein, presently scheduled for June 26, 1950, at Washington, D. C., filed on June 13, 1950, by Ralph D. Epperson, Mount Airy, North Carolina, one of the applicants herein, stating that additional time is needed before going to hearing for the preparation of an engineering study of certain interference problems, and requesting a waiver of the Commission's four-day rule; and

It appearing that the attorneys for the parties hereto and the Commission Counsel have advised verbally that no objection will be raised to the petitioner's request for a waiver of the four-day rule, and no objection to the grant of the petition has been made;

It is therefore ordered, This 16th day of June 1950, that the four-day rule be and it is hereby waived, the petition requesting a 60-day continuance is granted, and the hearing herein is hereby continued to August 28, 1950, at 10:00 a. m., in Washington, D. C.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
[SEAL] T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5623; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:56 a. m.]

[Docket No. 9605]

GULF BEACHES BROADCASTING CO., INC.

ORDER CONTINUING HEARING

In re application of Gulf Beaches Broadcasting Company, Inc., St. Petersburg Beach, Florida, for construction permit; Docket No. 9605, File No. BP-7302.

The Commission having under consideration a petition filed on June 15, 1950, by the Gulf Beaches Broadcasting Company, Inc., requesting that the hearing now scheduled to be held on the above-entitled application, be continued for a period of ninety days; and

It appearing, that all of the parties to the proceeding have consented to a grant of the said petition and to a waiver of § 1.745 of the Commission's rules;

It is ordered, This 15th day of June 1950, that the petition be, and it is hereby, granted; and that the hearing on the above-entitled application is hereby continued to 10:00 a. m., Monday, September 18, 1950, at Washington, D. C.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
[SEAL] T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5626; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:56 a. m.]

[Docket Nos. 9615, 9616]

VALLEY BROADCASTING CO. (KLOK) AND CHARLES E. SALIK (KCBQ)

ORDER CONTINUING HEARING

In re applications of E. L. Barker, Claribel Barker, T. H. Canfield and Opal A. Canfield, d/b as Valley Broadcasting Company (KLOK), San Jose, California, for construction permit, Docket No. 9615, File No. BP-7400; Charles E. Salik (KCBQ), San Diego, California, for modification of license, Docket No. 9616, File No. BML-1392.

The Commission having under consideration a petition requesting a 90-day continuance of the hearing herein, presently scheduled for July 7, 1950, in Washington, D. C., filed by one of the applicants, Charles E. Salik (KCBQ), San Diego, California, stating that the petitioner is now negotiating for the services of a new consulting engineer to be employed within the next few weeks and this new consulting engineer will need sufficient time to examine the application and work out a plan, in cooperation with the engineer for KLOK, to reexamine the engineering proposals to see whether one or both proposals might not be amended and thus possibly avoid a hearing; and

It appearing that counsel for the other parties and counsel for the Commission

have no objection to the immediate consideration and grant of this petition; and

It appearing that an indefinite continuance would be preferable, procedurally, to the 90-day continuance requested, and counsel for the applicants and for the Commission have indicated that they have no objection to an indefinite continuance;

It is therefore ordered, This 16th day of June 1950, that the petition, insofar as it requests a continuance, is hereby granted and the hearing is hereby continued indefinitely.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
[SEAL] T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5624; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:56 a. m.]

[Docket No. 9654]

SEVIER VALLEY BROADCASTING CO. (KSVC)

ORDER CONTINUING HEARING

In re application of Sevier Valley Broadcasting Company (KSVC), Richfield, Utah, for renewal of license; Docket No. 9654, File No. BR-2232.

It is ordered, This 15th day of June 1950, on the Commission's own motion, that the hearing in the above-entitled matter, which is presently scheduled for July 11, 1950, at Richfield, Utah, be, and it is hereby, continued to August 7, 1950, in Richfield, Utah.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
[SEAL] T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5625; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:56 a. m.]

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

[Docket No. E-6282]

WISCONSIN POWER AND LIGHT CO.

NOTICE OF ORDER AUTHORIZING MERGER OR CONSOLIDATION OF FACILITIES

JUNE 22, 1950.

Notice is hereby given that, on June 21, 1950, the Federal Power Commission issued its order entered June 20, 1950, authorizing merger or consolidation of facilities of Wisconsin Power and Light Company with those of Interstate Light and Power Company (Wisconsin).

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5518; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:45 a. m.]

[Docket No. E-6283]

NORTHWESTERN ILLINOIS GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

NOTICE OF ORDER AUTHORIZING MERGER OR CONSOLIDATION OF FACILITIES

JUNE 22, 1950.

Notice is hereby given that, on June 21, 1950, the Federal Power Commission issued its order entered June 20, 1950, authorizing merger or consolidation of facilities of Northwestern Illinois Gas & Electric Company with those of Interstate Light and Power Company (Illinois).

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5519; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:45 a. m.]

[Docket No. G-962]

TENNESSEE GAS TRANSMISSION CO.

NOTICE OF ORDER FURTHER AMENDING ORDER ISSUING CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY

JUNE 22, 1950.

Notice is hereby given that, on June 20, 1950, the Federal Power Commission issued its order entered June 20, 1950, in the above-designated matter, further amending Paragraph (A) (ii) of the orders of May 3, 1949 (14 F. R. 2385), and November 15, 1949 (14 F. R. 7114), issuing certificate of public convenience and necessity.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5520; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:45 a. m.]

[Docket No. G-962]

TENNESSEE GAS TRANSMISSION CO.

NOTICE OF ORDER DISMISSING PETITION FOR AMENDMENT OF ORDER ISSUING CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY

JUNE 22, 1950.

Notice is hereby given that, on June 20, 1950, the Federal Power Commission issued its order entered June 20, 1950, dismissing petition for amendment of Paragraph (C) of the order of December 7, 1948, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on December 14, 1948 (13 F. R. 7719), issuing certificate of public convenience and necessity in the above-designated matter.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5521; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:45 a. m.]

[Docket No. G-963]

COMMONWEALTH NATURAL GAS CORP.

NOTICE OF ORDER AMENDING ORDER ISSUING CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY

JUNE 22, 1950.

Notice is hereby given that, on June 21, 1950, the Federal Power Commission issued its order entered June 20, 1950, amending order of March 30, 1950, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on April 6, 1950 (15 F. R. 1959), issuing certificate of public convenience and necessity in the above-designated matter.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5522; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:45 a. m.]

[Docket No. G-1301]

TENNESSEE GAS TRANSMISSION CO.

NOTICE OF FINDINGS AND ORDER ISSUING CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY

JUNE 22, 1950.

Notice is hereby given that, on June 21, 1950, the Federal Power Commission issued its findings and order entered June 20, 1950, issuing certificate of public convenience and necessity in the above-designated matter.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5523; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:45 a. m.]

[Project No. 199]

SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SERVICE AUTHORITY

NOTICE OF ORDER AUTHORIZING AMENDMENT OF LICENSE (MAJOR)

JUNE 22, 1950.

Notice is hereby given that, on June 21, 1950, the Federal Power Commission issued its order entered June 20, 1950, authorizing amendment of license (major) in the above-designated matter.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5524; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:45 a. m.]

[Docket No. G-1414]

TRANSCONTINENTAL GAS PIPE LINE CORP.

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

JUNE 22, 1950.

Take notice that on June 7, 1950, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation (Applicant), a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Houston, Texas, filed an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity, pursuant to section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, as amended, authorizing the construction and operation of an extension of its presently certificated 30-inch main line, approximately 11.25 miles in length, of pipe ranging in size between 20 inches and 26 inches O. D., beginning at a point on Applicant's presently certificated main line, near East Carteret, New Jersey, extending thence easterly across Middlesex County, New Jersey, to Arthur Kill, thence across Arthur Kill to Staten Island, New York, thence easterly across Staten Island to a point on the east side of Staten Island at the so-called "Narrows," lying approximately 500 feet north of the junction of Hylan Boulevard and the Narrows, thence across the Narrows to a point in the Bay Ridge section of Brooklyn, New York, which lies between Shore Parkway and Shore Road, between Eighty-ninth and Ninety-first Streets, there to connect with the so-called "New York Facilities," which were certificated by the Commission in Dockets Nos. G-1167, G-1171, and G-1190.

The proposed facilities will be used as an auxiliary connection designed to

serve Consolidated Edison Company of New York, The Brooklyn Union Gas Company, Long Island Lighting System, Brooklyn Borough Gas Company, and Kings County Lighting Company.

The estimated over-all capital cost will approximate $3,585,082.

Protests or petitions to intervene may be filed with the Federal Power Commission, Washington 25, D. C., in accordance with the rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10) before the 10th days of July 1950. The application is on file with the Commission for public inspection.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5525; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:45 a. m.]

[Docket No. G-1419]

PRINCE GEORGE'S GAS CORP.

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

JUNE 22, 1950.

Take notice that Prince George's Gas Corporation (Applicant), a Maryland corporation, address, Chillum, Prince George's County, Maryland, filed on June 12, 1950, an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity pursuant to section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, authorizing the construction and operation of approximately 20 miles of 22-inch natural gas transmission pipeline between a point of connection with the transmission pipeline facilities of Atlantic Seaboard Corporation near Rockville, Maryland, and Applicant's storage and compressor station located at Chillum, Maryland.

Applicant proposes to utilize said facilities to transport increased volumes of natural gas from the facilities of Atlantic Seaboard Corporation to Applicant's Chillum Station for delivery to the distribution system of Applicant's parent, Washington Gas Light Company. Said facilities also will be used to make deliveries of natural gas to the distribution system of Washington Gas Light Company of Maryland, Inc., another subsidiary of Washington Gas Light Company. Applicant estimates the ultimate delivery capacity of said facilities will be 122,000 Mcf. of natural gas per day. Applicant states that the proposed facilities are required to augment the existing gas transmission facilities of Washington Gas Light Company and its subsidiaries, which facilities are inadequate to supply the increased demands for gas service in the District of Columbia and adjoining areas in Maryland and Virginia.

The total over-all capital cost of the proposed facilities is estimated to be approximately $1,360,000.00. The capital requirement for the construction of said facilities will be supplied by Washington Gas Light Company in the form of advances on open account, without interest charges.

Protests or petitions to intervene may be filed with the Federal Power Commission, Washington 25, D. C., in accordance with the rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10) on or before the 10th day of July, 1950. The application is on file with the Commission for public inspection.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5526; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:46 a. m.]

[Docket No. G-1420]

HOPE NATURAL GAS CO.

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

JUNE 22, 1950.

Take notice that Hope Natural Gas Company (Applicant), a West Virginia corporation, address, Clarksburg, West Virginia, filed on June 13, 1950, an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity pursuant to section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, authorizing the construction and operation of a new 12¾ inch pipeline approximately 7,600 feet in length to extend from Applicant's present 12-inch transmission pipeline near its Hunt Compressing Station in Kanawha County, West Virginia to a point of connection with the Tennessee Gas Transmission Company's transmission pipeline No. 2 in Kanawha County, West Virginia.

Applicant proposes by means of the said facilities to receive delivery of additional volumes of natural gas from Tennessee Gas Transmission Company into its system north of Applicant's Cornwell Compressor Station, and, by receiving approximately 25,000 Mcf. per day through said facilities to bring its receipt of gas up to its full contract obligation from Tennessee Gas Transmission Company. No new markets or areas are proposed to be served through the proposed facilities, but Applicant states that they will enable Applicant to render more adequate service to its present markets.

Protests or petitions to intervene may be filed with the Federal Power Commission, Washington 25, D. C., in accordance with the rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10) on or before the 10th day of July 1950. The application is on file with the Commission for public inspection.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5527; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:46 a. m.]

[Docket No. G-1392]

JERSEY CENTRAL POWER & LIGHT CO.

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

JUNE 22, 1950.

Take notice that Jersey Central Power & Light Company (Applicant), a New Jersey corporation, having its principal place of business at Asbury Park, New Jersey, filed on June 12, 1950, an amendment to its application filed on May 17, 1950, for a certificate of public convenience and necessity pursuant to section 7 of the Natural Gas Act authorizing the construction and operation of certain natural gas transmission facilities described in the notice at 15 F. R. 3508. By the amendment it seeks authorization to transport natural gas through existing facilities in New Jersey as hereinafter described.

Applicant proposes to connect its proposed new line with an existing pipeline extending from a point near Ocean City southward to a point near Townsend's Inlet and to another existing line connecting the following towns and cities: Avalon, Peermont, Stone Harbor, Cape May Courthouse, Burleigh, Wildwood, Wildwood Crest, Cape May City, and others.

Protests or petitions to intervene may be filed with the Federal Power Commission, Washington 25, D. C., in accordance with the rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10) on or before the 10th day of July, 1950. The application, as amended, is on file with the Commission for public inspection.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5528; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:57 a. m.]

[Docket No. G-1412]

CITIES OF RIPLEY, BOONEVILLE, AND BALDWYN, MISS.

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

JUNE 22, 1950.

Take notice that the Cities of Ripley, Booneville, and Baldwyn, Mississippi (Applicants), filed on June 6, 1950, a joint application for an order pursuant to section 7 (a) of the Natural Gas Act, as amended, directing Tennessee Gas Transmission Company (Tennessee), a Delaware corporation, address, Houston, Texas, to establish physical connection of its transportation facilities with the proposed facilities of Applicants and to sell to Applicants a supply of natural gas adequate to meet their requirements.

Applicants propose the construction of approximately 16 miles of 6-inch lateral pipeline from Tennessee's transmission pipeline to Ripley and 5 miles of 2½-inch pipeline to Blue Mountain, to be owned and operated by the City of Ripley to provide natural gas service to the inhabitants of Ripley and Blue Mountain, Mississippi; approximately 23 miles of 6-inch pipeline extending from Ripley to Booneville, to be owned and operated by the City of Booneville to provide natural gas service to the inhabitants of Booneville, Mississippi; and approximately 11 miles of 4-inch pipeline extending from Booneville to Baldwyn to be owned and operated by the City of Baldwyn to provide natural gas service to customers along the route of said pipeline and to the inhabitants of Baldwyn and Wheeler, Mississippi, together with regulator, check meter and town border stations required to provide the service proposed. Applicants estimate that the capacity of the pipeline to the City of Booneville will be 342 Mcf per hour and of the pipeline to Baldwyn will be 35 Mcf per hour.

The estimated total over-all construction cost of the proposed facilities is $1,283,150 which will be paid for by the issuance of revenue bonds by each of the Applicants covering the cost of its proposed facilities.

Protests or petitions to intervene may be filed with the Federal Power Commission, Washington 25, D. C., in accordance with the rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10) on or before the 10th day of July 1950. The application is on file with the Commission for public inspection.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5629; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:57 a. m.]

[Docket No. G-1418]

MONTANA-DAKOTA UTILITIES CO.

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

JUNE 22, 1950.

Take notice that Montana-Dakota Utilities Co. (Applicant), a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at Minneapolis, Minnesota, filed June 12, 1950, an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity pursuant to section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, authorizing the construction and operation of the natural gas facilities described as follows:

900 feet of 6-inch pipeline extending from Applicant's existing gas transmission pipeline near Hardin, Montana, to connect with the gas distribution system of that city.

The City of Hardin is presently being served natural gas from local wells. These wells, however, are rapidly depleting and the Applicant plans to supplement the supply with natural gas produced and transported from the Worland, Wyoming, gas fields. The above described facilities are to connect the Applicant's transmission system with its distribution system within the city.

The estimated total cost of facilities including the necessary operating appurtenances is $7,100 which will be financed out of funds on hand.

Protests or petitions to intervene may be filed with the Federal Power Commission, Washington 25, D. C., in accordance with the rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8 and 1.10) on or before the 10th day of July 1950. The application is on file with the Commission for public inspection.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5630; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:57 a. m.]

[Docket No. G-1421]

CITIES SERVICE GAS CO.

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

JUNE 22, 1950.

Take notice that on June 13, 1950, Cities Service Gas Company (Applicant), a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, filed an application (1) for a certificate of public convenience and necessity pursuant to section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, as amended, authorizing Applicant to construct and operate the following natural-gas facilities:

(A) Three additional 1,000 hp. gas engine compressor units at Applicant's existing North Welda Station, located in Section 34, Township 21 South, Range 19 East, Anderson County, Kansas, together with engine water cooling facilities, gas cooling facilities, and electric generating facilities appurtenant to the entire station.

(B) A new gas compressor station consisting of three 230 hp. gas engine compressor units and appurtenant facilities in the Northwest Quarter (NW¼) of the Northwest Quarter (NW¼) of Section 36, Township 12 South, Range 23 East, Johnson County, Kansas.

and (2) for permission and approval pursuant to section 7 (b) of the Natural Gas Act to abandon and remove the facilities comprising Applicant's South Welda Compressor Station located in the Northeast Quarter (NE¼) of Section 3, Township 22 South, Range 19 East, Anderson County, Kansas, consisting of three 230 hp. compressor units, two 170 hp. compressor units, and one 160 hp. compressor unit, together with appurtenant facilities.

Applicant states the facilities in paragraph (A) will be used to inject gas into and to withdraw gas from Applicant's existing North and South Welda Storage Fields; that to meet peak-day system requirements it is contemplated the amount of gas which may be withdrawn from such storage fields will be increased by 35,000 Mcf. per day. Facilities described in paragraph (B) will be utilized to withdraw gas from Applicant's existing Craig Storage Field in Johnson County, Kansas, rendering assistance in withdrawing gas from such field to meet peak-day emergencies.

The application recites that by increasing the capacity of the North Welda Station and by abandoning the South Welda Station substantial economies and simplification of operations will be effected; the estimated savings in operation and maintenance being estimated as being in excess of $10,000 annually. No service heretofore rendered through the facilities to be abandoned will be affected or impaired.

The estimated total over-all capital cost of the proposed facilities is $885,000, funds for the payment of which will be furnished from the treasury of the Applicant. Cost of retirement, net charge to depreciation reserve and credit to salvage are stated to be $14,600, $59,833 and $81,000, respectively.

Protests or petitions to intervene may be filed with the Federal Power Commission, Washington 25, D. C., in accordance with the rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10) on or before the 10th day of July 1950. The application is on file with the Commission for public inspection.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5631; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:57 a. m.]

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

[4th Sec. Application 25196]

BITUMINOUS COAL FROM KENTUCKY TO WHITE BRIDGE, TENN.

APPLICATION FOR RELIEF

JUNE 23, 1950.

The Commission is in receipt of the above-entitled and numbered application for relief from the long-and-short-haul provision of section 4 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Filed by: The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway for itself and on behalf of the Illinois Central Railroad Company.

Commodities involved: Bituminous coal, carloads.

From: Mines in western Kentucky.

To: White Bridge, Tenn.

Grounds for relief: Circuitous routes.

Any interested person desiring the Commission to hold a hearing upon such application shall request the Commission in writing so to do within 15 days from the date of this notice. As provided by the general rules of practice of the Commission, Rule 73, persons other than applicants should fairly disclose their interest, and the position they intend to take at the hearing with respect to the application. Otherwise the Commission, in its discretion, may proceed to investigate and determine the matters involved in such application without further or formal hearing. If because of an emergency a grant of temporary relief is found to be necessary before the expiration of the 15-day period, a hearing, upon a request filed within that period, may be held subsequently.

By the Commission, Division 2.

[SEAL] W. P. BARTEL,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5543; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:49 a. m.]

[4th Sec. Application 25197]

PETROLEUM PRODUCTS FROM JACKSONVILLE, FLA., TO FLORIDA AND GEORGIA

APPLICATION FOR RELIEF

JUNE 23, 1950.

The Commission is in receipt of the above-entitled and numbered application for relief from the long-and-short-haul provision of section 4 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Filed by: R. E. Boyle, Jr., Agent, for and on behalf of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company and other carriers named in the application.

Commodities involved: Gasoline, kerosene, naphtha, naphtha distillate and petroleum distillate fuel oil, tank carloads.

From: Jacksonville and South Jacksonville, Fla.

To: Tifton, Ga., Greenville, Jasper, Madison and Perry, Fla.

Grounds for relief: Circuitous routes.

Schedules filed containing proposed rates: C. A. Spaninger's tariff I. C. C. No. 1065, Supplement 159.

Any interested person desiring the Commission to hold a hearing upon such application shall request the Commission in writing so to do within 15 days from the date of this notice. As provided by the general rules of practice of the Commission, Rule 73, persons other than applicants should fairly disclose their interest, and the position they intend to take at the hearing with respect to the application. Otherwise the Commission, in its discretion, may proceed to investigate and determine the matters involved in such application without further or formal hearing. If because of an emergency a grant of temporary relief is found to be necessary before the expiration of the 15-day period, a hearing, upon a request filed within that period, may be held subsequently.

By the Commission, Division 2.

[SEAL] W. P. BARTEL, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5544; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:49 a. m.]

[4th Sec. Application 25198]

PIG IRON FROM TEXAS TO GRAND HAVEN, MICH.

APPLICATION FOR RELIEF

JUNE 23, 1950.

The Commission is in receipt of the above-entitled and numbered application for relief from the long-and-short-haul provision of section 4 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Filed by: D. Q. Marsh, Agent, for and on behalf of carriers parties to his tariff I. C. C. No. 3752.

Commodities involved: Pig iron, carloads.

From: Daingerfield and Lone Star, Tex.

To: Grand Haven, Mich.

Grounds for relief: Competition with rail carriers and circuitous routes.

Schedules filed containing proposed rates: D. Q. Marsh's tariff I. C. C. No. 3752, Supplement 450.

Any interested person desiring the Commission to hold a hearing upon such application shall request the Commission in writing so to do within 15 days from the date of this notice. As provided by the general rules of practice of the Commission, Rule 73, persons other than applicants should fairly disclose their interest, and the position they intend to take at the hearing with respect to the application. Otherwise the Commission, in its discretion, may proceed to investigate and determine the matters involved in such application without further or formal hearing. If because of an emergency a grant of temporary relief is found to be necessary before the expiration of the 15-day period, a hearing, upon a request filed within that period, may be held subsequently.

By the Commission, Division 2.

[SEAL] W. P. BARTEL, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5545; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:49 a. m.]

[4th Sec. Application 25199]

FORMALDEHYDE FROM TEXAS AND OKLAHOMA TO SCOTCHLITE SIDING, MINN.

APPLICATION FOR RELIEF

JUNE 23, 1950.

The Commission is in receipt of the above-entitled and numbered application for relief from the long-and-short-haul provision of section 4 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Filed by: D. Q. Marsh, Agent, for and on behalf of carriers parties to his tariffs I. C. C. Nos. 3708 and 3752.

Commodities involved: Liquid formaldehyde, tank carloads.

From: Tallant, Okla., Bishop and Winnie, Tex.

To: Scotchlite Siding, Minn.

Grounds for relief: Competition with rail carriers and circuitous routes.

Schedules filed containing proposed rates: D. Q. Marsh's tariffs I. C. C. Nos. 3708 and 3752, Supplements 258 and 451, respectively.

Any interested person desiring the Commission to hold a hearing upon such application shall request the Commission in writing so to do within 15 days from the date of this notice. As provided by the general rules of practice of the Commission, Rule 73, persons other than applicants should fairly disclose their interest, and the position they intend to take at the hearing with respect to the application. Otherwise the Commission, in its discretion, may proceed to investigate and determine the matters involved in such application without further or formal hearing. If because of an emergency a grant of temporary relief is found to be necessary before the expiration of the 15-day period, a hearing, upon a request filed within that period, may be held subsequently.

By the Commission, Division 2.

[SEAL] W. P. BARTEL, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5546; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:49 a. m.]

[4th Sec. Application 25200]

SCRAP ALUMINUM FROM TEXAS TO OFFICIAL TERRITORY

APPLICATION FOR RELIEF

JUNE 23, 1950.

The Commission is in receipt of the above-entitled and numbered application for relief from the long-and-short-haul provision of section 4 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Filed by: D. Q. Marsh, Agent, for and on behalf of carriers parties to his tariff I. C. C. No. 3752.

Commodities involved: Scrap aluminum, carloads.

From: Points in Texas.

To: Points in Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

Grounds for relief: Circuitous routes.

Schedules filed containing proposed rates: D. Q. Marsh's tariff I. C. C. No. 3752, Supplement 449.

Any interested person desiring the Commission to hold a hearing upon such application shall request the Commission in writing so to do within 15 days from the date of this notice. As provided by the general rules of practice of the Commission, Rule 73, persons other than applicants should fairly disclose their interest, and the position they intend to take at the hearing with respect to the application. Otherwise the Commission, in its discretion, may proceed to investigate and determine the matters involved in such application without further or formal hearing. If because of an emergency a grant of temporary relief is found to be necessary before the expiration of the 15-day period, a hearing, upon a request filed within that period, may be held subsequently.

By the Commission, Division 2.

[SEAL] W. P. BARTEL, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5547; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:49 a. m.]

[Rev. SO. 562, Rev. King's I. C. C. Order 26]

WESTERN PACIFIC RAILROAD CO. ET AL.

DIVERSION OR REROUTING OF TRAFFIC

In the opinion of Homer C. King, Agent, The Western Pacific Railroad Company, Chicago Rock Island and Pacific Railroad Company, Chicago Great Western Railway Company, and The Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad Company, because of work stoppage are unable to transport traffic routed over and to points on their lines: It is ordered, that:

(a) *Rerouting traffic.* The Western Pacific Railroad Company, Chicago Rock Island and Pacific Railroad Company, Chicago Great Western Railway Company, and The Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad Company and their connections, are authorized and directed to reroute or divert traffic routed over and to points on its line, over any available route to expedite the movement; the billing covering all such cars rerouted shall carry a reference to this order as authority for the rerouting.

(b) *Concurrence of receiving roads to be obtained.* The railroads named or their connections, desiring to divert or reroute traffic over the line or lines of another carrier under this order shall confer with the proper transportation officer of the railroad or railroads to which such traffic is to be diverted or rerouted, and shall receive the concurrence of such other railroads before the rerouting or diversion is ordered.

(c) *Notification to shippers.* The carrier rerouting cars in accordance with this order shall notify each shipper at the time each car is rerouted or diverted and shall furnish to such shipper the new routing provided under this order.

(d) Inasmuch as the diversion or rerouting of traffic by said Agent is deemed to be due to carrier's disability, the rates applicable to traffic diverted or rerouted by said Agent shall be the rates which were applicable at the time of shipment on the shipments as originally routed.

(e) In executing the directions of the Commission and of such Agent provided

for in this order, the common carriers involved shall proceed even though no contracts, agreements, or arrangements now exist between them with reference to the divisions of the rates of transportation applicable to said traffic; divisions shall be, during the time this order remains in force, those voluntarily agreed upon by and between said carriers; or upon failure of the carriers to so agree, said divisions shall be those hereafter fixed by the Commission in accordance with pertinent authority conferred upon it by the Interstate Commerce Act.

(f) *Effective date.* This order shall become effective at 9:00 a. m., June 23, 1950.

(g) *Expiration date.* This order shall expire at 11:59 p. m., July 31, 1950, unless otherwise modified, changed, suspended, or annulled.

It is further ordered, That this order shall be served upon the Association of American Railroads, Car Service Division, as agent of all railroads subscribing to the car service and per diem agreement under the terms of that agreement and by filing it with the Director, Division of the Federal Register.

Issued at Washington, D. C., June 23, 1950.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
HOMER C. KING,
Agent.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5518; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:49 a. m.]

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[File No. 7-1240]

MOTOROLA, INC.

NOTICE OF APPLICATION FOR UNLISTED TRADING, PRIVILEGES, AND OF OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING

At a regular session of the Securities and Exchange Commission, held at its office in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 22d day of June A. D. 1950.

The Boston Stock Exchange, pursuant to section 12 (f) (2) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-12F-1 thereunder, has made application for unlisted trading privileges in the Common Stock, $3 Par Value, of Motorola, Inc., a security listed and registered on the New York Stock Exchange. Rule X-12F-1 provides that the applicant shall furnish a copy of the application to the issuer and to every exchange on which the security is listed or already admitted to unlisted trading privileges. The application is available for public inspection at the Commission's principal office in Washington, D. C.

Notice is hereby given that, upon request of any interested person received prior to July 5, 1950, the Commission will set this matter down for hearing. In addition, any interested person may submit his views or any additional facts bearing on this application by means of a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D. C. If no one requests a hearing on this matter, this application will be determined by order of the Commission on the basis of the facts stated in the application, and other information contained in the official file of the Commission pertaining to this matter.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5529; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:46 a. m.]

[File No. 70-2391]

POTOMAC EDISON CO. ET AL.

ORDER GRANTING AND PERMITTING JOINT APPLICATION-DECLARATION TO BECOME EFFECTIVE

At a regular session of the Securities and Exchange Commission held at its office in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 22d day of June A. D. 1950.

In the matter of the Potomac Edison Company, Northern Virginia Power Company, Potomac Light and Power Company, and South Penn Power Company, File No. 70-2391.

The Potomac Edison Company ("Potomac Edison"), a registered holding company and a public utility subsidiary of a registered holding company (the West Penn Electric Company), and its wholly-owned public utility subsidiary companies, Northern Virginia Power Company ("Northern Virginia"), Potomac Light and Power Company ("Potomac Light"), and South Penn Power Company ("South Penn") having filed a joint application-declaration, and one amendment thereto, with this Commission pursuant to sections 6, 7, 9, 10, and 12 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 and certain rules and regulations promulgated thereunder with respect to the following transactions:

The issuance and sale by Northern Virginia to Potomac Edison of 10,500 shares of Northern Virginia's common stock, par value $100 per share, for a total cash consideration of $1,050,000; the issuance and sale by Potomac Light to Potomac Edison of 4,000 shares of Potomac Light's common stock, par value $100 per share, for a total cash consideration of $400,000; the issuance and sale by South Penn to Potomac Edison of 58,000 shares of South Penn's capital stock, without par or nominal value, for an aggregate consideration of $290,000 ($5 per share) the aggregate stated value thereof; the acquisition by Potomac Edison of the above-described securities through the use of its treasury funds; and the pledge by Potomac Edison of these capital stocks with the trustee under the indenture securing Potomac Edison's First Mortgage and Collateral Trust Bonds;

It being represented in the filing that Northern Virginia and Potomac Light are to use the proceeds from the sale of these securities for necessary property additions and improvements and that South Penn will use the proceeds in part for necessary property additions and improvements and in part to discharge an open account indebtedness to Potomac Edison presently in the amount of $50,000;

Notice of the filing of this joint application-declaration having been duly given in the form and manner prescribed by Rule U-23 promulgated under the act and the Commission not having received a request for a hearing with respect thereto and not having ordered a hearing thereon;

The Commission finding with respect to this filing that all of the applicable statutory standards are satisfied, finding no basis for making any adverse findings with respect thereto, and deeming it appropriate in the public interest and in the interests of investors and consumers that this joint application-declaration be granted and permitted to become effective forthwith;

It is hereby ordered, Pursuant to said Rule U-23 and the applicable provisions of the act that this joint application-declaration be, and the same hereby is, granted and permitted to become effective forthwith subject to the terms and conditions prescribed in Rule U-24.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5528; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:46 a. m.]

[File No. 70-2392]

PHILADELPHIA CO.

ORDER GRANTING AND PERMITTING APPLICATION-DECLARATION TO BECOME EFFECTIVE

At a regular session of the Securities and Exchange Commission, held at its office in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 21st day of June 1950.

Philadelphia Company ("Philadelphia"), a registered holding company and a subsidiary of Standard Gas and Electric Company ("Standard Gas") and Standard Power and Light Corporation, both registered holding companies, having filed an application-declaration, and amendments thereto, pursuant to the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 ("act"), particularly sections 9 (a), 11 (b), 12 (c) and 12 (d) thereof and Rules U-42, U-44, and U-50 thereunder, regarding the following transactions:

The sale by Philadelphia, pursuant to the competitive bidding requirements of Rule U-50, of $11,000,000 principal amount of Twenty-Year 3⅜% Sinking Fund Debentures due March 1, 1970, of Equitable Gas Company, a former subsidiary of Philadelphia, and the application of the proceeds from such sale, to the extent required, together with such part as may be required of the balance of the proceeds realized by Philadelphia in connection with the previously consummated sale by Philadelphia of all the outstanding Common Stock of Equitable Gas Company, to the redemption and retirement of the presently outstanding 100,000 shares of Philadelphia's $6 Cumulative Preference Stock, at the redemption price of $110 per share plus an amount equal to all dividends accrued and unpaid thereon at the redemption date; and

The Commission having, by order dated June 1, 1948, as supplemented by

its order dated March 14, 1950, in proceedings under section 11 (b) of the act, directed, among other things, that Philadelphia dispose of its interest, direct or indirect, in Equitable Gas Company and that Philadelphia take appropriate steps to liquidate and dissolve; and

A public hearing having been held after appropriate notice, and the Commission having examined the record and having made and filed its findings and opinion herein:

It is ordered, That the application-declaration, as amended be, and the same hereby is, granted and permitted to become effective forthwith, subject to the terms and conditions prescribed in Rule U-24 and to the following additional terms and conditions:

(1) That the proposed sale of $11,000,000 principal amount of the aforesaid Debentures shall not be consummated until the results of competitive bidding, held with respect thereto, have been made a matter of record in this proceeding and a further order shall have been issued by this Commission on the basis of the record so completed, which order may contain further terms and conditions as may then be deemed appropriate; and

(2) That, for the purposes of this case, the ten-day solicitation period required by Rule U-50 be shortened to a period of not less than six days.

It is further ordered, That jurisdiction be, and the same hereby is, reserved with respect to the following matters:

(1) All fees and expenses proposed to be paid in connection with the proposed transactions, including fees and expenses to be paid to counsel for the successful bidder; and

(2) The use by Philadelphia of any proceeds from the sale of the aforesaid Debentures in excess of the amount required for the redemption and retirement of Philadelphia's outstanding $6 Cumulative Preferred Stock.

Applicant-declarant having requested the Commission to enter an order containing approvals and recitals in accordance with the meaning and requirements of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, including section 1808 (f) and Supplement R thereof, and it appearing appropriate to the Commission that such an order be entered:

It is hereby ordered and recited, That the sales, transfers, conveyances, receipts, expenditures and investments hereinafter described and recited in subparagraphs I and II below which are proposed by Philadelphia in the application-declaration, as amended, above mentioned are hereby authorized and approved, are necessary and appropriate to effectuate the provisions of section 11 (b) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 and the orders of the Commission previously entered thereunder, and, as to the application and expenditure of a part of the balance of the proceeds from the sale of the Common Stock of Equitable Gas Company or an amount equal thereto, are necessary and appropriate to the integration and simplification of the holding company system of which Philadelphia is a member, all in accordance with the meaning and requirements of Supplement R of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and section 1808 (f) thereof, the stock and securities and other property to be sold, transferred, conveyed, acquired or received upon such transactions, and the expenditures and investments to be made, being specified and itemized as follows:

I. The sale by Philadelphia for cash of $11,000,000 principal amount of Twenty-Year 3⅜ percent Sinking Fund Debentures due March 1, 1970, of Equitable Gas Company, and the transfer and delivery by Philadelphia of said Debentures and the receipt by Philadelphia of the purchase price therefor.

II. The application and expenditure by Philadelphia of the entire proceeds derived by it from the sale specified in subparagraph I above, to the extent required, together with such part as may be required of the balance of the proceeds from the sale by Philadelphia of the Common Stock of Equitable Gas Company (pursuant to the Commission's order dated March 14, 1950) in excess of the amount previously expended for retirement of Philadelphia's bonds and notes, or an amount equal to such part of such balance, in and for the prompt redemption, retirement and cancellation, at the redemption price of $110 per share plus an amount equal to accrued and unpaid dividends to the date of redemption, of the entire 100,000 shares of $6 Cumulative Preference Stock of Philadelphia.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5531; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:47 a. m.]

[File No. 70-2395]

MISSISSIPPI POWER & LIGHT CO.

SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER RELEASING JURISDICTION OVER FEES AND EXPENSES AND GRANTING AND PERMITTING APPLICATION-DECLARATION TO BECOME EFFECTIVE

At a regular session of the Securities and Exchange Commission held at its office in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 21st day of June A. D. 1950.

Mississippi Power & Light Company ("Mississippi"), a utility subsidiary of Middle South Utilities, Inc. ("Middle South"), a registered holding company, having filed an application-declaration and amendments thereto pursuant to the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, particularly sections 6 (a), 7 and 12 (c) thereof and Rules U-42 and U-50 of the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder with respect to the issuance and sale by Mississippi pursuant to the competitive bidding requirements of Rule U-50, of $7,500,000 principal amount of First Mortgage Bonds __ Percent Series due 1980, and 85,000 shares of __ Percent Preferred Stock, of the par value of $100 per share; and

The Commission by order dated June 12, 1950, having granted said application, and permitted said declaration to become effective, subject to the condition that the proposed issuance and sale of bonds and preferred stock should not be consummated until the results of competitive bidding pursuant to Rule U-50 should have been made a matter of record in this proceeding, and a further order entered by the Commission in the light of the record as so completed, and subject to a reservation of jurisdiction with respect to fees and expenses to be paid in connection with the proposed transactions; and

A further amendment to the said application-declaration having been filed on June 21, 1950, setting forth the action taken by Mississippi to comply with the requirements of Rule U-50, and stating that pursuant to the invitation for competitive bids the following bids for the said bonds and preferred stock have been received:

BONDS

Bidding group	Coupon rate (percent)	Price to company percent of principal amount	Cost to company (percent)
Halsey, Stuart & Co., Inc..	2¾	101.524	2.7996
White, Weld & Co. Kidder, Peabody & Co.	2¾	101.4019	2.8036
Equitable Securities Corp.. Shields & Co.	2¾	101.314	2.8099
Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane	2¾	101.301	2.8105
Union Securities Corp	2¾	101.27999	2.8116
The First Boston Corp. W. C. Langley & Co.	2¾	100.70999	2.8397

PREFERRED STOCK

Bidding group	Dividend rate (percent)	Price to company	Annual cost to company (percent)
Union Securities Corp	4.80	$100.10	4.7952
Lehman Bros	4.85	100.551	4.8234
W. C. Langley & Co. The First Boston Corp. Blyth & Co.	4.90	100.30	4.8853
Equitable Securities Corp. Shields & Company White, Weld & Co. Kidder, Peabody & Co.	4.90	100.19	4.8907

Said amendment to the application-declaration also setting forth that with respect to the bonds Mississippi has accepted the bid of the group headed by Halsey, Stuart & Co., Inc., as shown above, and that said bonds will be offered for sale to the public at 101.924 percent of the principal amount thereof plus accrued interest from June 1, 1950, to the date of delivery, resulting in an underwriters' spread of 0.40 percent of the principal amount of said bonds; and

Said amendment also setting forth that Mississippi has rejected all the bids for the preferred stock as set out above, and that Halsey, Stuart & Co., Inc., has waived the requirement under the "Statement of Terms and Conditions Relating to Bids" that proposals for the bonds and preferred stock be accepted simultaneously; and

Said amendment also setting forth the fees and expenses incurred in connection with the issuance and sale of said bonds, which fees and expenses are estimated in the aggregate amount of $41,750 including the following legal fees and expenses:

Reid & Priest (New York counsel for the company)	$5,000
Green, Green and Cheney (local counsel for the company)	2,500
Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam & Roberts (counsel for the Underwriters—fee to be paid by the purchaser of the securities)	3,500

The Commission having examined said amendment, and having considered the record herein, and finding no reason for the imposition of terms and conditions with respect to the results of competitive bidding for the bonds, and it also appearing to the Commission that the fees and expenses relating to the issuance and sale of said bonds, are not unreasonable, it appearing to the Commission appropriate to reserve jurisdiction to entertain further proceedings with respect to the issuance and sale of the preferred stock.

It is ordered, That jurisdiction heretofore reserved with respect to the matters to be determined as the result of competitive bidding under Rule U-50, and with respect to the fees and expenses to be paid in connection with the issuance and sale of said bonds, be, and the same hereby is, released, and that said application-declaration, as amended, be, and the same hereby is, granted and permitted to become effective, forthwith, subject to the terms and conditions contained in Rule U-24, and subject to the further condition that the preferred stock shall not be sold until a further order shall have been entered herein in the light of appropriate further proceedings.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5539; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:48 a. m.]

[File No. 70-2397]

ARKANSAS POWER & LIGHT CO.

SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER RELEASING JURISDICTION OVER FEES AND EXPENSES AND GRANTING AND PERMITTING APPLICATION-DECLARATION TO BECOME EFFECTIVE

At a regular session of the Securities and Exchange Commission held at its office in the city of Washington, D. C. on the 21st day of June A. D. 1950.

Arkansas Power & Light Company ("Arkansas"), a utility subsidiary of Middle South Utilities, Inc. ("Middle South"), a registered holding company, having filed an application-declaration and amendments thereto pursuant to the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, particularly sections 6 (b) and 12 (c) thereof, and Rules U-42 and U-50 of the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder, with respect to the issuance and sale by Arkansas, pursuant to the competitive bidding requirements of Rule U-50, of $6,000,000 principal amount of First Mortgage Bonds __ Percent Series due 1980, and 155,000 shares of __ Percent Preferred Stock of the par value of $100 per share; and

The Commission by order dated June 12, 1950, having granted said application, and permitted said declaration to become effective, subject to the condition that the proposed issuance and sale of bonds and preferred stock should not be consummated until the results of competitive bidding pursuant to Rule U-50 should have been made a matter of record in this proceeding, and a further order entered by the Commission in the light of the record as so completed, and subject to a reservation of jurisdiction with respect to fees and expenses to be paid in connection with the proposed transactions; and

A further amendment to the said application-declaration having been filed on June 21, 1950, setting forth the action taken by Arkansas to comply with the requirements of Rule U-50, and stating that pursuant to the invitation for competitive bids the following bids for the said bonds and preferred stock have been received:

BONDS

Bidding group	Coupon rate (percent)	Price to company percent of principal amount	Cost to company (percent)
Halsey, Stuart & Co., Inc.	2¾	101.333	2.8090
Lehman Bros.	2¾	101.209	2.8151
Stone & Webster Securities Corp.	2¾	101.209	2.8151
Equitable Securities Corp.	2¾	101.199	2.8155
Central Republic Co.	2¾	101.199	2.8155
Union Securities Corp.	2¾	101.019	2.8244
The First Boston Corp.	2¾	100.70999	2.8397
White, Weld & Co.	2¾	100.639	2.8432

PREFERRED STOCK

Bidding group	Dividend rate (percent)	Price to company	Annual cost to company (percent)
Lehman Bros.	4.95	$100.003	4.9499
Equitable Securities Corp.	4.95	$100.003	4.9499
White, Weld & Co.	4.95	$100.003	4.9499

Said amendment to the application-declaration also setting forth that with respect to the bonds Arkansas has accepted the bid of the group headed by Halsey, Stuart & Co., Inc., as shown above, and that said bonds will be reoffered for sale to the public at 101.75% of the principal amount thereof plus accrued interest from June 1, 1950, to the date of delivery, resulting in an underwriters' spread of 0.417% of the principal amount of said bonds; and

Said amendment also setting forth that Arkansas has rejected the bid for the preferred stock set forth above, and that Halsey, Stuart & Co., Inc., has waived the requirement under the "Statement of Terms and Conditions Relating to Bids" that proposals for the bonds and preferred stock be accepted simultaneously; and

Said amendment also setting forth the fees and expenses relating to the issuance and sale of said bonds, which fees and expenses are estimated in the aggregate amount of $65,000, including the following legal fees and expenses:

Reid & Priest (New York counsel for the company)	$3,750
House, Moses & Holmes (local counsel for the company)	2,100
White & Case (counsel for the Underwriters—fee to be paid by the purchaser of the securities)	8,000

The Commission having examined said amendment, and having considered the record herein, and finding no reason for the imposition of terms and conditions with respect to the results of competitive bidding for the bonds, and it also appearing to the Commission that the fees and expenses relating to the issue and sale of said bonds as estimated, are not unreasonable, it appearing to the Commission appropriate to reserve jurisdiction to entertain further proceedings with respect to the issuance and sale of the preferred stock:

It is ordered, That jurisdiction heretofore reserved with respect to the matters to be determined as the result of competitive bidding under Rule U-50, and with respect to the fees and expenses in connection with the issuance and sale of said bonds be, and the same hereby is, released, and that said application-declaration, as amended, be, and the same hereby is, granted and permitted to become effective, forthwith, subject to the terms and conditions contained in Rule U-24, and subject to the further condition that the preferred stock shall not be sold until a further order shall have been entered herein in the light of appropriate further proceedings.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5538; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:48 a. m.]

[File No. 812-659]

EQUITY CORP. ET AL.

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

At a regular session of the Securities and Exchange Commission, held at its office in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 21st day of June A. D. 1950.

Notice is hereby given that the Equity Corporation (Equity), 103 Park Avenue, New York, New York, on behalf of itself and all corporations affiliated with it at present or in the future (hereinafter referred to collectively as the Equity Group), has filed an amended application pursuant to section 6 (c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 requesting an order exempting from the provisions of section 17 (a) of the act, the direct offering and performance of any and all contracts of insurance between any present or future member of the Equity Group which is an insurance company and any other present or future member of the Equity Group.

The Equity Corporation, American General Corporation, and First York Corporation are closed-end, non-diversified management investment companies registered under the act. The Equity Corporation owns 76.07 percent of the voting securities of American General Corporation which, in turn, owns 81.98 percent of the voting securities of First York Corporation and 61.35 percent of the voting securities of the Morris Plan Corporation. At the present time the insurance companies in the Equity Group include Industrial Insurance Company, Bankers Security Life Insurance Society, Hawkeye Casualty Com-

pany, Security Fire Insurance Company, Erie Insurance Company and Northeastern Insurance Company of Hartford. The order requested by the application would permit any of the aforementioned insurance companies or any insurance company which might in the future become affiliated with Equity to offer and sell insurance to any present or future member of the Equity Group. Any such transaction is made unlawful by section 17 (a) of the act unless an exemption therefrom is granted by the Commission.

The applicant undertakes with respect to such proposed transactions that

(1) No brokerage fees will be paid by any insurance company in the Equity Group, to any affiliated person or to any affiliated person of an affiliated person in the Equity Group, in connection with the solicitation or placement of insurance coverage involving property or interests of a member of the Equity Group;

(2) No insurance company in the Equity Group will retain at any time a premium volume, in connection with coverage of property or interests within the Equity Group, in excess of 1% of the total volume of premiums in force of such insurance company, after giving effect to reinsurance arrangements; and

(3) All members of the Equity Group will use their best efforts and take all usual and customary steps, before placing or writing insurance with or for affiliated companies, to determine the most advantageous contracts offered by comparable nonaffiliated companies, and will not in any case willfully or knowingly place or write insurance with or for affiliated companies at rates or upon terms which are less favorable than can be obtained from comparable nonaffiliated insurance companies.

For a more detailed statement of the matters of fact and law asserted, all persons are referred to said application which is on file in the offices of the Commission in Washington, D. C.

Notice is further given that an order granting the application, in whole or in part and upon such conditions as the Commission may deem necessary or appropriate, may be issued by the Commission at any time after July 7, 1950, unless prior thereto a hearing upon the application is ordered by the Commission, as provided in Rule N-5 of the rules and regulations promulgated under the act. Any interested person may, not later than July 5, 1950, at 5:30 p. m., e. d. s. t., submit to the Commission in writing his views or any additional facts bearing upon this application or the desirability of a hearing thereon, or request the Commission in writing that a hearing be held thereon. Any such communication or request should be addressed: Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 425 Second Street NW., Washington 25, D. C., and should state briefly the nature of the interest of the person submitting such information or requesting a hearing, the reasons for such request, and the issues of fact or law raised by the application which he desires to controvert.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5530; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:46 a. m.]

SIDNEY ASCHER

ORDER FOR PROCEEDINGS AND NOTICE OF HEARING

At a regular session of the Securities and Exchange Commission held at its office in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 21st day of June 1950.

In the matter of Sidney Ascher, 302 East 38th Street, New York City, New York.

I. The Commission's public official files disclose that Sidney Ascher, hereinafter referred to as registrant, is registered as a broker-dealer pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

II. The Records Officer of the Commission has filed with the Commission a statement, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof,[1] stating that registrant did not file with the Commission reports of his financial condition during the calendar years 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948 or 1949 as required by section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted thereunder.

III. The information reported to the Commission by its Records Officer as set forth in pargaraph II hereof tends, if true, to show that registrant violated section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted under said section.

IV. The Commission, having considered the aforesaid information, deems it necessary and appropriate in the public interest and for the protection of investors that proceedings be instituted to determine:

(a) Whether the statements set forth in paragraph II hereof are true;

(b) Whether registrant has wilfully violated section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted under said section;

(c) Whether, pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, it is in the public interest to revoke registration of registrant; and

(d) Whether, pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, pending final determination, it is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors to suspend the registration of registrant.

V. *It is ordered,* That registrant be given an opportunity for hearing as set forth in paragraph IV hereof on the 17th day of July 1950 at the main office of the Securities and Exchange Commission, located at 425 Second Street NW., Washington 25, D. C., before a Hearing Examiner to be designated by the Commission. On such date the Hearing Room Clerk in Room 101, North Building, will advise the parties and the Hearing Examiner as to the room in which such hearing will be held. The Commission will consider any motion with respect to a change of place of said hearing if said motion is filed with the Secretary of the Commission on or before July 10, 1950. Upon completion of any such hearing in this matter the Hearing Examiner shall prepare a recommended decision pursuant to Rule IX of the rules of practice unless such decision is waived.

It is further ordered, That in the event registrant does not appear personally or through a representative at the time and place herein set or as otherwise ordered, the Hearing Room Clerk shall file with the Records Officer of the Commission a written statement to that effect and thereupon the Commission will take the record under advisement for decision.

This order and notice shall be served on registrant personally or by registered mail forthwith, and published in the FEDERAL REGISTER not later than fifteen (15) days prior to July 17, 1950.

In the absence of an appropriate waiver, no officer or employee of the Commission engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions in this or any factually related proceeding will be permitted to participate or advise in the decision upon the matter except as witness or counsel in proceedings held pursuant to notice. Since this proceeding is not "rule making" within the meaning of section 4 (c) of the Administrative Procedure Act, it is not deemed to be subject to the provisions of the section delaying the effective date of any final Commission action.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5537; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:48 a. m.]

DAVID BRODY

ORDER FOR PROCEEDINGS AND NOTICE OF HEARING

At a regular session of the Securities and Exchange Commission held at its office in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 21st day of June 1950.

In the matter of David Brody, Room 809-810, 26 Beaver Street, New York City, New York.

I. The Commission's Public official files disclose that David Brody, hereinafter referred to as registrant, is registered as a broker-dealer pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

II. The Records Officer of the Commission has filed with the Commission a statement, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof,[1] stating that registrant did not file with the Commission reports of his financial condition during the calendar years 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948 or 1949 as required by section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted thereunder.

[1] Filed as part of the original document.

III. The information reported to the Commission by its Records Officer as set forth in paragraph II hereof tends, if true, to show that registrant violated section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted under said section.

IV. The Commission, having considered the aforesaid information, deems it necessary and appropriate in the public interest and for the protection of investors that proceedings be instituted to determine:

(a) Whether the statements set forth in Paragraph II hereof are true;

(b) Whether registrant has wilfully violated section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted under said section;

(c) Whether, pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, it is in the public interest to revoke registration of registrant; and

(d) Whether, pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, pending final determination, it is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors to suspend the registration of registrant.

V. *It is ordered*, That registrant be given an opportunity for hearing as set forth in paragraph IV hereof on the 17th day of July 1950 at the main office of the Securities and Exchange Commission, located at 425 Second Street NW., Washington 25, D. C., before a Hearing Examiner to be designated by the Commission. On such date the Hearing Room Clerk in Room 101, North Building, will advise the parties and the Hearing Examiner as to the room in which such hearing will be held. The Commission will consider any motion with respect to a change of place of said hearing if said motion is filed with the Secretary of the Commission on or before July 10, 1950. Upon completion of any such hearing in this matter the Hearing Examiner shall prepare a recommended decision pursuant to Rule IX of the rules of practice unless such decision is waived.

It is further ordered, That in the event registrant does not appear personally or through a representative at the time and place herein set or as otherwise ordered, the Hearing Room Clerk shall file with the Records Officer of the Commission a written statement to that effect and thereupon the Commission will take the record under advisement for decision.

This order and notice shall be served on registrant personally or by registered mail forthwith, and published in the FEDERAL REGISTER not later than fifteen (15) days prior to July 17, 1950.

In the absence of an appropriate waiver, no officer or employee of the Commission engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions in this or any factually related proceeding will be permitted to participate or advise in the decision upon the matter except as witness or counsel in proceedings held pursuant to notice. Since this proceeding is not "rule making" within the meaning of section 4 (c) of the Administrative Procedure Act, it is not deemed to be subject to the provisions of the section delaying the effective date of any final Commission action.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5536; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:48 a. m.]

BRYSON & CO.

ORDER FOR PROCEEDINGS AND NOTICE OF HEARING

At a regular session of the Securities and Exchange Commission held at its office in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 21st day of June 1950.

In the matter of William Bryson, d/b/a Bryson & Company, Suite 518, 2 Rector Street, New York City, New York.

I. The Commission's public official files disclose that William Bryson, d/b/a Bryson & Company, hereinafter referred to as registrant, is registered as a broker-dealer pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

II. The Records Officer of the Commission has filed with the Commission a statement, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof,[1] stating that registrant did not file with the Commission reports of his financial condition during the calendar years 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948 or 1949 as required by section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted thereunder.

III. The information reported to the Commission by its Records Officer as set forth in paragraph II hereof tends, if true, to show that registrant violated section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted under said section.

IV. The Commission, having considered the aforesaid information, deems it necessary and appropriate in the public interest and for the protection of investors that proceedings be instituted to determine:

(a) Whether the statements set forth in paragraph II hereof are true;

(b) Whether registrant has wilfully violated section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted under said section;

(c) Whether, pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, it is in the public interest to revoke registration of registrant; and

(d) Whether, pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, pending final determination, it is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors to suspend the registration of registrant.

V. *It is ordered*, That registrant be given an opportunity for hearing as set forth in paragraph IV hereof on the 17th day of July 1950, at the main office of the Securities and Exchange Commission, located at 425 Second Street NW., Washington 25, D. C., before a Hearing Examiner to be designated by the Commission. On such date the Hearing Room Clerk in Room 101, North Building, will advise the parties and the Hearing Examiner as to the room in which such hearing will be held. The Commission will consider any motion with respect to a change of place of said hearing if said motion is filed with the Secretary of the Commission on or before July 10, 1950. Upon completion of any such hearing in this matter the Hearing Examiner shall prepare a recommended decision pursuant to Rule IX of the rules of practice unless such decision is waived.

It is further ordered, That in the event registrant does not appear personally or through a representative at the time and place herein set or as otherwise ordered, the Hearing Room Clerk shall file with the Records Officer of the Commission a written statement to that effect and thereupon the Commission will take the record under advisement for decision.

This order and notice shall be served on registrant personally or by registered mail forthwith, and published in the FEDERAL REGISTER not later than fifteen (15) days prior to July 17, 1950.

In the absence of an appropriate waiver, no officer or employee of the Commission engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions in this or any factually related proceeding will be permitted to participate or advise in the decision upon the matter except as witness or counsel in proceedings held pursuant to notice. Since this proceeding is not "rule making" within the meaning of section 4 (c) of the Administrative Procedure Act, it is not deemed to be subject to the provisions of the section delaying the effective date of any final Commission action.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5535; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:47 a. m.]

LAURENCE STEELE COSTELLE

ORDER FOR PROCEEDINGS AND NOTICE OF HEARING

At a regular session of the Securities and Exchange Commission held at its office in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 21st day of June 1950.

In the matter of Laurence Steele Costelle, 44 Wall Street, New York City, New York.

I. The Commission's public official files disclose that Laurence Steele Costelle, hereinafter referred to as registrant, is registered as a broker-dealer pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

II. The Records Officer of the Commission has filed with the Commission a statement, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof,[1] stating that registrant did not file with the Commission reports of his financial condition during the calendar years 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, or 1949 as required by section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted thereunder.

[1] Filed as part of the original document.

III. The information reported to the Commission by its Records Officer as set forth in paragraph II hereof tends, if true, to show that registrant violated section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted under said section.

IV. The Commission, having considered the aforesaid information, deems it necessary and appropriate in the public interest and for the protection of investors that proceedings be instituted to determine:

(a) Whether the statements set forth in paragraph II hereof are true;

(b) Whether registrant has wilfully violated section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted under said section;

(c) Whether, pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, it is in the public interest to revoke registration of registrant; and

(d) Whether, pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, pending final determination, it is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors to suspend the registration of registrant.

V. *It is ordered*, That registrant be given an opportunity for hearing as set forth in paragraph IV hereof on the 17th day of July 1950 at the main office of the Securities and Exchange Commission, located at 425 Second Street NW., Washington 25, D. C., before a Hearing Examiner to be designated by the Commission. On such date the Hearing Room Clerk in Room 101, North Building, will advise the parties and the Hearing Examiner as to the room in which such hearing will be held. The Commission will consider any motion with respect to a change of place of said hearing if said motion is filed with the Secretary of the Commission on or before July 10, 1950. Upon completion of any such hearing in this matter the Hearing Examiner shall prepare a recommended decision pursuant to Rule IX of the rules of practice unless such decision is waived.

It is further ordered, That in the event registrant does not appear personally or through a representative at the time and place herein set or as otherwise ordered, the Hearing Room Clerk shall file with the Records Officer of the Commission a written statement to that effect and thereupon the Commission will take the record under advisement for decision.

This order and notice shall be served on registrant personally or by registered mail forthwith, and published in the FEDERAL REGISTER not later than fifteen (15) days prior to July 17, 1950.

In the absence of an appropriate waiver, no officer or employee of the Commission engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions in this or any factually related proceeding will be permitted to participate or advise in the decision upon the matter except as witness or counsel in proceedings held pursuant to notice. Since this proceeding is not "rule making" within the meaning of section 4 (c) of the Administrative Procedure Act, it is not deemed to be subject to the provisions of the section delaying the effective date of any final Commission action.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5534; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:47 a. m.]

W. C. CRIDER

ORDER FOR PROCEEDINGS AND NOTICE OF HEARING

At a regular session of the Securities and Exchange Commission held at its office in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 21st day of June 1950.

In the matter of W. C. Crider, 68 State Street, Albany, New York.

I. The Commission's public official files disclose that W. C. Crider, hereinafter referred to as registrant, is registered as a broker-dealer pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

II. The Records Officer of the Commission has filed with the Commission a statement, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof,[1] stating that registrant did not file with the Commission reports of his financial condition during the calendar years 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948 or 1949 as required by section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted thereunder.

III. The information reported to the Commission by its Records Officer as set forth in paragraph II hereof tends, if true, to show that registrant violated section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted under said section.

IV. The Commission, having considered the aforesaid information, deems it necessary and appropriate in the public interest and for the protection of investors that proceedings be instituted to determine:

(a) Whether the statements set forth in paragraph II hereof are true;

(b) Whether registrant has wilfully violated section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted under said section;

(c) Whether, pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, it is in the public interest to revoke registration of registrant; and

(d) Whether, pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, pending final determination, it is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors to suspend the registration of registrant.

V. *It is ordered*, That registrant be given an opportunity for hearing as set forth in paragraph IV hereof on the 17th day of July 1950 at the main office of the Securities and Exchange Commission, located at 425 Second Street NW., Washington 25, D. C., before a Hearing Examiner to be designated by the Commission. On such date the Hearing Room Clerk in Room 101, North Building, will advise the parties and the Hearing Examiner as to the room in which such hearing will be held. The Commission will consider any motion with respect to a change of place of said hearing if said motion is filed with the Secretary of the Commission on or before July 10, 1950. Upon completion of any such hearing in this matter the Hearing Examiner shall prepare a recommended decision pursuant to Rule IX of the rules of practice unless such decision is waived.

It is further ordered, That in the event registrant does not appear personally or through a representative at the time and place herein set or as otherwise ordered, the Hearing Room Clerk shall file with the Records Officer of the Commission a written statement to that effect and thereupon the Commission will take the record under advisement for decision.

This order and notice shall be served on registrant personally or by registered mail forthwith, and published in the FEDERAL REGISTER not later than fifteen (15) days prior to July 17, 1950.

In the absence of an appropriate waiver, no officer or employee of the Commission engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions in this or any factually related proceeding will be permitted to participate or advise in the decision upon the matter except as witness or counsel in proceedings held pursuant to notice. Since this proceeding is not "rule making" within the meaning of section 4 (c) of the Administrative Procedure Act, it is not deemed to be subject to the provisions of the section delaying the effective date of any final Commission action.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5533; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:47 a. m.]

ARTHUR V. CURRY

ORDER FOR PROCEEDINGS AND NOTICE OF HEARING

At a regular session of the Securities and Exchange Commission held at its office in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 21st day of June 1950.

In the matter of Arthur V. Curry, 210 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York, and 89-14 118th Street, Richmond Hill, New York City, New York.

I. The Commission's public official files disclose that Arthur V. Curry, hereinafter referred to as registrant, is registered as a broker-dealer pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

II. The Records Officer of the Commission has filed with the Commission a statement, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof,[1] stating that registrant did not file with the Commission reports of his financial condition during the calendar years 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948 or 1949 as required by section 17 (a) of the Securities Ex-

[1] Filed as part of the original document.

change Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted thereunder.

III. The information reported to the Commission by its Records Officer as set forth in paragraph II hereof tends, if true, to show that registrant violated section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted under said section.

IV. The Commission, having considered the aforesaid information, deems it necessary and appropriate in the public interest and for the protection of investors that proceedings be instituted to determine:

(a) Whether the statements set forth in paragraph II hereof are true;

(b) Whether registrant has wilfully violated section 17 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule X-17A-5 adopted under said section;

(c) Whether, pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, it is in the public interest to revoke registration of registrant; and

(d) Whether, pursuant to section 15 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, pending final determination, it is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors to suspend the registration of registrant.

V. *It is ordered*, That registrant be given an opportunity for hearing as set forth in paragraph IV hereof on the 17th day of July 1950 at the main office of the Securities and Exchange Commission, located at 425 Second Street NW., Washington 25, D. C., before a Hearing Examiner to be designated by the Commission. On such date the Hearing Room Clerk in Room 101, North Building, will advise the parties and the Hearing Examiner as to the room in which such hearing will be held. The Commission will consider any motion with respect to a change of place of said hearing if said motion is filed with the Secretary of the Commission on or before July 10, 1950. Upon completion of any such hearing in this matter the Hearing Examiner shall prepare a recommended decision pursuant to Rule IX of the rules of practice unless such decision is waived.

It is further ordered, That in the event registrant does not appear personally or through a representative at the time and place herein set or as otherwise ordered, the Hearing Room Clerk shall file with the Records Officer of the Commission a written statement to that effect and thereupon the Commission will take the record under advisement for decision.

This order and notice shall be served on registrant personally or by registered mail forthwith, and published in the FEDERAL REGISTER not later than fifteen (15) days prior to July 17, 1950.

In the absence of an appropriate waiver, no officer or employee of the Commission engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions in this or any factually related proceeding will be permitted to participate or advise in the decision upon the matter except as witness or counsel in proceedings held pursuant to notice. Since this proceeding is not "rule making" within the meaning of section 4 (c) of the Administrative Procedure Act, it is not deemed to be subject to the provisions of the section delaying the effective date of any final Commission action.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5532; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:47 a. m.]

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of Alien Property

AUTHORITY: 40 Stat. 411, 55 Stat. 839, Pub. Laws 322, 671, 79th Cong., 60 Stat. 50, 925; 50 U. S. C. and Supp. App. 1, 616; E. O. 9193, July 6, 1942, 3 CFR, Cum. Supp., E. O. 9567, June 8, 1945, 3 CFR, 1945 Supp., E. O. 9788, Oct. 14, 1946, 11 F. R. 11981.

[Return Order 613]

SOCIETE DE PROSPECTION ELECTRIQUE (PROCEDES SCHLUMBERGER)

Having considered the claim set forth below and having issued a determination allowing the claim, which is incorporated by reference herein and filed herewith,

It is ordered, That the claimed property, described below and in the determination, including all royalties accrued thereunder and all damages and profits recoverable for past infringement thereof, be returned after adequate provision for taxes and conservatory expenses:

Claimant, Claim No., Notice of Intention To Return Published, and Property

Societe de Prospection Electrique (Procedes Schlumberger), Paris, France; Claim No. 12806; March 23, 1950 (15 F. R. 1650). All interests and rights (including all royalties and other monies payable or held with respect to such interests and rights and all damages for breach of the agreement hereinafter described, together with the right to sue therefor) created in Societe de Prospection Electrique (Procedes Schlumberger) by virtue of an agreement dated January 1, 1935 (including all modifications thereof and supplements thereto, if any) by and between Societe de Prospection Electrique (Procedes Schlumberger) and Schlumberger Well Surveying Corporation, which agreement relates, among other things, to Patent No. 2,191,119; to the extent owned by the claimant immediately prior to the vesting thereof by Vesting Order No. 3432 (9 F. R. 4657, May 3, 1944).

All interests and rights (including all royalties and other monies payable or held with respect to such interests and rights and all damages for breach of the agreements hereinafter described, together with the right to sue therefor) created in Societe de Prospection Electrique (Procedes Schlumberger), by virtue of an agreement dated January 1, 1936 (including all modifications thereof and supplements thereto, including, but without limitation, letters from Societe de Prospection Electrique to Schlumberger Well Surveying Corporation, dated respectively January 27, 1937; August 4, 1937; September 27, 1937; January 20, 1938; February 21, 1938; September 9, 1938 and October 4, 1938, and letters from E. G. Leonardon to Societe de Prospection Electrique dated respectively February 16, 1937; August 17, 1937; February 3, 1938; and September 24, 1938) by and between Societe de Prospection Electrique (Procedes Schlumberger) and Schlumberger Well Surveying Corporation, which agreement relates, among other things, to Patent No. 2,290,075; to the extent owned by claimant immediately prior to the vesting thereof by Vesting Order No. 3432 including royalties in the amount of $776,464.66.

This return shall not be deemed to include the rights of any licensees under the above patent contracts.

In connection with this return, claimant has furnished the Attorney General certain covenants contained in a letter dated September 28, 1949. These covenants are attached to the Determination filed herewith as Exhibit A.

Appropriate documents and papers effectuating this order will issue.

Executed at Washington, D. C., on June 20, 1950.

For the Attorney General.

[SEAL] HAROLD I. BAYNTON, *Acting Director, Office of Alien Property.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-5471; Filed, June 23, 1950; 8:49 a. m.]

[Vesting Order 14752]

EVA VON HEYDEBRECK

In re: Stock owned by and debts owing to Eva von Heydebreck; F-38-2564-A-1; C-1.

Under the authority of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, Executive Order 9193, as amended, and Executive Order 9788, and pursuant to law, after investigation, it is hereby found:

1. That Eva von Heydebreck, whose last known address is 47½ Nieder-Aschau, Oberbayern, Germany, is a resident of Germany and a national of a designated enemy county (Germany);

2. That the property described as follows:

a. Those certain shares of stock described in Exhibit A, attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof, registered in the name of the persons set forth in the aforesaid Exhibit A, and presently in the custody of The New York Trust Company, 100 Broadway, New York, New York, in an account entitled H. M. H. Albert de Bary & Co., N. V., Amsterdam, Holland, together with all declared and unpaid dividends thereon,

b. Three (3) shares of $25.00 par value capital stock of Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City, New York, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New Jersey, being a part of the four (4) shares of the above described stock, evidenced by a certificate numbered 3C123079, registered in the name of J. C. Orr & Co., which certificate is presently in the custody of The New York Trust Company, 100 Broadway, New York, New York, in an account entitled H. M. H. Albert de Bary & Co., N. V., Amsterdam, Holland, together with any and all declared and unpaid dividends thereon,

c. Four (4) shares of $15.00 par value capital stock of Consolidated Natural Gas Company, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City, New York, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, being a part of the twenty-six (26) shares of the above described stock evidenced by a certificate numbered 0277649, registered in the name of Cobb & Co., which certificate is presently

in the custody of The New York Trust Company, 100 Broadway, New York, New York, in an account entitled H. M. H. Albert de Bary & Co., N. V., Amsterdam, Holland, together with any and all declared and unpaid dividends thereon,

d. Two (2) shares of $10.00 par value common capital stock of Wisconsin Electric Power Company, 231 West Michigan Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Wisconsin, being a part of the five (5) shares of the above described stock evidenced by a certificate numbered PM35674, registered in the name of J. C. Orr & Co., which certificate is presently in the custody of The New York Trust Company, 100 Broadway, New York, New York, in an account entitled H. M. H. Albert de Bary & Co., N. V., Amsterdam, Holland, together with any and all declared and unpaid dividends thereon,

e. That certain debt or other obligation of The New York Trust Company, 100 Broadway, New York, New York, arising out of the receipt, on and after May 10, 1940, of cash dividends derived from the shares of stock described in the aforesaid Exhibit A and subparagraphs 2–b, 2–c and 2–d hereof constituting a portion of the sum of money on deposit with The New York Trust Company, in a blocked dollar account, entitled H. M. H. Albert de Bary & Co., N. V., Amsterdam, Holland, maintained at the aforesaid bank, and any and all rights to demand, enforce and collect the same,

f. That certain debt or other obligation of The New York Trust Company, 100 Broadway, New York, New York, arising out of the receipt, on and after May 10, 1940, of the proceeds of the redemption of and interest coupons collections from one (1) $1,000 Glen Alden Coal Company 1st Mortgage 4% Bond, due September 1, 1965, bearing the number 16638, which proceeds are presently on deposit with The New York Trust Company, in a blocked dollar account, entitled H. M. H. Albert de Bary & Co., N. V., Amsterdam, Holland, maintained at the aforesaid bank, and any and all rights to demand, enforce and collect the same, and

g. That certain debt or other obligation owing to Eva von Heydebreck, by American Express Company, 65 Broadway, New York, New York, in the amount of $300.00, as of December 31, 1945, together with any and all accruals thereto, evidenced by five (5) unredeemed American Express Company travelers checks, of which four (4) are in the face amount of $50.00 and are numbered P9663498 to P9663501, inclusive, and one (1) is in the face amount of $100.00 and is numbered R3169410, and any and all rights to demand, enforce and collect the same,

is property within the United States owned or controlled by, payable or deliverable to, held on behalf of or on account of, or which is evidence of ownership or control by Eva von Heydebreck, the aforesaid national of a designated enemy country (Germany);

and it is hereby determined:

3. That to the extent that the person named in subparagraph 1 hereof is not within a designated enemy country, the national interest of the United States requires that such person be treated as a national of a designated enemy country (Germany).

All determinations and all action required by law, including appropriate consultation and certification, having been made and taken, and, it being deemed necessary in the national interest,

There is hereby vested in the Attorney General of the United States the property described above, to be held, used, administered, liquidated, sold or otherwise dealt with in the interest of and for the benefit of the United States.

The terms "national" and "designated enemy country" as used herein shall have the meanings prescribed in section 10 of Executive Order 9193, as amended.

Executed at Washington, D. C., on June 9, 1950.

For the Attorney General.

[SEAL] HAROLD I. BAYNTON,
Acting Director,
Office of Alien Property.

EXHIBIT A

Name and address of issuer	Place of incorporation	Certificate number	Number of shares	Par value	Type of stock	Registered name
Anaconda Copper Mining Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y.	Montana	G90325	15	$50	Capital	Cobb & Co.
		59096	6	$50		
		F895796	4	$50		
Climax Molybdenum Co., 505 Fifth Ave., New York 18, N. Y.	Delaware	NYO28399	50	No par	Common	Do.
General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Ave., New York, N. Y.	New York	NYE707558	50	No par	do	Do.
		NYE262048	30	No par		
Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Broad St. Station Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.	Pennsylvania	F247732	26	$50	Capital	Do.
		886090	3	$50		
		900418	1	$50		
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City, New York.	New Jersey	CC934950	40	$25	Capital	J. C. Orr & Co.
North American Co., 315 North 12th Blvd., St. Louis 1, Mo.	do	M107237	30	$10	Common	Do.
		M126686	10	$10		
Kansas Power & Light Co., 808 Kansas Ave., Topeka, Kans.	Kansas	NO52062	10	$8.75	Common	Do.
West Kentucky Coal Co., 44 South Main St., Madisonville, Ky.	New Jersey	A41307	4	$4	do	Do.

[F. R. Doc. 50–5617; Filed, June 27, 1950; 8:55 a. m.]